

DACCA UNIVERSITY SUPPLEMENT

THE ARAB INVASION OF INDIA

BY

R. C. MAJUMDAR, M.A., PH.D.

Professor, Dacca University, Ramna, Dacca

MADRAS

PRINTED AT THE DIOCESAN PRESS, VILPERY

1931

DACCA UNIVERSITY SUPPLEMENT

The Arab Invasion of India

By

R. C. MAJUMDAR, M.A., Ph.D.

Professor, Dacca University

Ramna, Dacca

INTRODUCTION

THE Muhammadan conquest of India is one of those epoch-making events which have left a permanent impress on subsequent ages. It may be regarded as the most important episode in the history of India since the Aryan invasion, as it has radically changed the entire aspect of Indian history such as no other event has yet done or is likely to do in future. No apology is therefore needed for an attempt to reconstruct the history of this all-important episode.

At first sight such an attempt may appear superfluous. For, thanks to the historical instinct of the Muhammadans, we possess contemporary or nearly contemporary records of their military expeditions and most of these are now available to general readers. But two considerations have impelled me to undertake the task, and these may be explained at the very outset.

In the first place, these chronicles refer to isolated chapters of that great episode, and, to have a correct perspective view of the whole, it is necessary to link them together in a continuous narrative.

Secondly, all these chronicles represent only one side of the picture. The victors are painted by themselves, and naturally their deeds loom large in these pages. Great caution and circumspection are, therefore, necessary in utilizing the data supplied by them. Besides, no serious student of history should be prepared to accept an one-sided version of the struggle recorded by one of the combatants, and must try to check the narrative by means of accounts given by the other side. The absence of Hindu chronicles has made this wholesome checking

impossible in the present instance and the evidence of Muhammadan historians, unchecked by other means, has gained currency as history.

The lack of Hindu evidence is, however, not as complete as is generally supposed. The archæological discoveries of the last hundred years have placed at our disposal a number of valuable data which at least help us in checking and correctly interpreting many of the episodes of this tragic drama. Time has, therefore, come for a critical study of the Muhammadan chronicles with the help of such Indian documents as are available to us, and such an attempt is made in the following pages.

The Muhammadan conquest of India may naturally be divided into three phases—according to the sources from which the invasions had proceeded, viz., Arabia, Ghazni and Ghor. It will be convenient to subject each of them to a separate review before we attempt to draw a general picture of the whole.¹ But in order to have an accurate idea of the first phase of the Muhammadan conquest, we must have a clear notion of the western border-land of India on the eve of Muhammadan invasion.

CHAPTER I

THE WESTERN BORDER-LAND OF INDIA ON THE EVE OF THE ARAB INVASION

The spirit of martial energy which the Prophet had infused into the Arabian people produced remarkable results. At the time of the death of the Prophet, in A.D. 632, His sovereignty did not extend beyond the Arabian peninsula. Within six years, Syria and Egypt were subdued by His successors. Northern Africa was conquered between A.D. 647 and 709 and Spain was subjugated by A.D. 713. Within a century of the death of the Prophet, the Muhammadans had advanced to the heart of France when their further progress was checked by the victory of Charles Martel between Tours and Poitiers in A.D. 732.

The Muhammadans attained equally brilliant success in the east. The mighty Persian Empire was laid low at the battle of Cadesia in A.D. 636, and within 8 years the whole of Persia as far east as Herat

¹ This article deals only with the first phase. The second and third phases will be similarly dealt with in future.

was annexed to the growing empire of the Arabs. By A.D. 650 its northern frontier was advanced to the Oxus and all the countries between that river and the Hindu Kush mountains were included in it.¹

These events which were destined to change the face of the world do not seem to have created any great stir in India and the Far East. The Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang who was proceeding at leisure along the Trans-Hindu Kush regions in A.D. 643 does not refer to any Arab conquest in his note of the political situation of the surrounding country. He writes an account of Persia under the old régime in blissful ignorance of the great catastrophe which had overwhelmed that ancient empire during the last decade. But while nearing the Oxus river he probably heard something of the political cataclysm that had overtaken these regions—for we find him suddenly giving up the old route which he had resolved to follow, and instead of proceeding through Balkh and Samarkhand he took an easterly route *via* Kashgar, Yarkand and Khotan.²

But although Hiuen Tsang had not probably heard of the Arab Empire, he has left a very interesting account of the countries bordering upon it in the east. Various speculations have been made by scholars regarding the political condition of these countries and the races to which their people belonged at this time, but we cannot probably have a better guide in this respect than the Chinese pilgrim who passed through those countries.

It appears from the accounts left by Hiuen Tsang that the western border-land of India was dominated at that time by three powerful Hindu kingdoms,—the kingdom of Kāpiśī in the north, that of Sindhu or Sind in the south, and the kingdom of Tsao-Kuta or Tsao-li between the two.

¹ Cf. *Muir-Caliphate*, Chapters 1-51, for details.

² On the eve of Hiuen Tsang's departure from India Harshavardhana addressed him as follows:—

'I know not by what route you propose to return. If you select the southern sea-route then I will send official attendants to accompany you.'

The pilgrim replied that the king of Kau-Ohang whom he visited on his way to India had prayed him to visit him on his return journey. He then continued 'My heart is unable to forego this duty; I will therefore return by the northern Road'. (*Beal-Life of Hiuen Tsang*, p. 183). This naturally leads to the inference that there must have been some special reasons which ultimately induced Hiuen Tsang to give up the old route which passed *via* Kau-Chang.

he entered the north of India and arrived in the Lan-po (Lampa) country.'

'Lan-po is supposed to represent the old Sanskrit Lampāka and the district has been identified with the modern Laghman.' This country was above 1,000 li in circuit and had recently become a dependency of Kāpiśī.¹

'The pilgrim proceeded from Lampa south-east, above 100 li, crossing a high mountain and a large river, and reached the Na-Kie (Ka)-lo-ho country.' The life of Hiuen Tsang represents him as going south instead of south-east.

'Na-ka-lo-ho had no king but was a province of Kāpiśī. It was above 600 li from east to west and 250 or 260 li from north to south.'

It is generally agreed that this country is represented by the modern district called Nungnehar and thus included the present district of Jalalabad, the valley of the Kabul river from Darunta on the west to Mirza Kheyl on the east, and according to Mr. Simpson, 'it might reach from about Jugduluck to the Khyber'.²

The pilgrim next proceeded south-east to Kan-to-lo (Gāndhāra country). 'This country was above 1,000 li from east to west and above 800 li north to south reaching on the east to the Sin-tu (Sindhu) river. The capital was Pu-lu-sha-pu-lo (Purushapura=Peshawar) and the country was subject to Kapis.'³

Now from what has been said above, it is quite clear that the kingdom of Kāpiśī, together with its subject states, extended from the frontiers of Bamian on the west to the river Indus on the east. Considering the fact that the two states Kāpiśī and Lan-po have to be placed between Bamian and Jalalabad we must regard the whole of the Kabul valley as comprised within the jurisdiction of Kāpiśī. As the kingdom of Kāpiśī itself was four thousand li in circuit, evidently the whole of Kafiristan also must have been included in it.

To the south of Gāndhāra lay Fa-la-na. According to Hiuen Tsang the country was over 4,000 li in circuit and was subject to Kāpiśī.⁴

¹ Watters, pp. 180-1. Kāpiśī is the correct form though Watters and other writers render it in various other ways (e.g. kapis, kapishek, etc.).

² Watters, pp. 182-5.

³ *Ibid*, pp. 198-9.

⁴ *Ibid*, vol. ii, p. 262.

There is no doubt that Fa-la-na corresponds to Varnnu, the name of a country in Pāṇini, and it has to be identified with the mountainous regions to the west of the Indus round the present Bannu district.¹

Thus the kingdom of Kāpiśi extended, roughly speaking, from Hindu Kush mountains to the Bannu district, and included the famous cities of Kabul, Jalalabad, and Peshawar.

It may be urged against this view that Cunningham has identified the kingdom called by Hiuen Tsang Fu-li-shih-sa-t'ang-na with the Kabul district.² Apart from the fact that this identification has not been accepted by others, there are insuperable objections to it. Without going into a detailed examination of the question, it will suffice here to state that between Fan-yen-na and Na-ko-lo-ho of Hiuen Tsang, which all authorities agree in identifying respectively with the Bamian and the Jalalabad district, the pilgrim locates two kingdoms, Kāpiśi and Lan-po, the former above 4,000 li (800 miles) and the latter above 1,000 li (200 miles) in circuit. It is, therefore, impossible to identify the Fu-li-shih-sa-t'ang-na, which was 2000 li (400 miles) from east to west, and 1,000 li (200 miles) from north to south with the Kabul district.

There is an indirect evidence to show that Kabul was included in Kāpiśi. The Chinese traveller Ou-Kóng who visited Afghanistan in A.D. 753 states that the eastern capital of Ki-pin was in Gāndhāra.³ As Watters has pointed out, the Kāpiśi of Hiuen Tsang denotes the same country as Ki-pin,⁴ and the inclusion of Gāndhāra in Kipin corroborates this view. Now Ou-Kóng says that the reigning king of Gāndhāra, and therefore of Ki-pin, was a descendant of Kanishka.⁵ On the other hand Alberuni refers to the Shāhiya rulers of Kabul as descendants of Kanishka.⁶ It is therefore reasonable to hold that the kingdom of Kāpiśi or Ki-pin denotes the Shāhiya territory and included Kabul.

¹ Watters, pp. 262-3; Stein—*Report of Arch. Survey* in N. W. F. Province, Peshawar, 1905, p. 5. Mr. S. N. Majumdar's note on p. 679 of his edition of Cunningham's *Ancient Geography*.

² Watters, vol. ii, p. 267.

³ *Journal Asiatique*, 1895, p. 349.

⁴ Watters, vol. i, p. 123. The same view is expressed by Cordier (*La Chine*, vol. i, p. 24) and Sten Konow (*Ep. Indica*, vol. xiv, p. 292).

⁵ *Journal Asiatique*, 1895, p. 356.

⁶ Sachau—*Alberuni*, Ch. XLIX, vol. ii, p. 13.

Assuming the identity of Ki-pin and Kāpīśī, which seems to rest on quite satisfactory grounds, it is interesting to note the close alliance between this kingdom and the Chinese court. During the period between 619 and 750 no less than six embassies were sent from Ki-pin to China.¹ The Chinese historians sometimes even regard Ki-pin as a vassal state of the Chinese empire,² but this need not indicate anything more than an alliance between two states of unequal power. This alliance was apparently sought as a protection against the menace of Arab conquest. It is also interesting to note that the fear of Arab invasion forced the kingdom of Udyāna to come under the protection of Ki-pin and this incorporation took place before 745 A.D., when the king of Ki-pin took the title of king of Ki-pin and Udyāna.³ Udyāna comprised the present districts of Swāt, Panjkora, Bijāwar, and Bunir.⁴ With this addition Ki-pin or Kāpīśī, or the Shāhiya kingdom of Kabul, as we may call it on the authority of later texts comprised the whole of the trans-Indus districts, to the south of Hindu Kush mountains, Chitral and Gilgit.

II. The kingdom of Sind adjoined Bannu, the southern-most part of the territories of the king of Kāpīśī. It comprised at least four states, viz., Sind proper, A-tien-po-chih-lo, Pi-to-shih-lo and A-fan-tu. It is difficult to locate definitely any of these states, but the four together certainly comprised the entire valley of the lower Indus to the south of the point where that river is joined by its five tributaries, its northern boundary being formed by the kingdoms of Multan on the left and Bannu on the right side of the Indus.

Immediately to the west of Sindhu lay the kingdom of Lang-kie-lo which roughly corresponded to modern Makrān and Kirmān. According to Hiuen Tsang, it was subject to the kingdom of Persia which lay immediately to the west. The town of Ho-mo, identified with Ormuz, was on the border of the two countries.

To the north of Lang-kie-lo, and west of Bannu lay the kingdom of Ki-kiang-na (Kekkāna) (corresponding to Kíkánán or Al-Kíkán of Arabic history). It had no chief ruler but was divided among a number of independent clans.

¹ *Journal Asiatique*, 1895, p. 376.

² *Ibid*; also Cordier—*La Chine*, vol. i, p. 454.

³ *Journal Asiatique*, 1895, p. 348 f. n. 3,

⁴ Watters, vol. i, p. 226.

As we shall see later on, according to Chach-nāma, Multan, Lang-kie-lo and Ki-kiang-na were all dependencies of Sind. Hiuen Tsang does not seem to have personally visited Sind and hence his information was not very accurate. We must remember also that according to Chach-nāma sometimes these outlying provinces declared independence, as for example shortly after the accession of Chach in A.D. 622. Hiuen Tsang's account may refer to such a period. But the categorical and detailed statements in Chach-nāma, would certainly entitle us to include all these territories in Sind.

III. Beyond the territories mentioned above, and between the kingdoms of Sind on the south, Fa-la-na (Bannu) and Ki-kiang-na (Kekkāna) on the east and south-east, and Kāpiśi with its tributaries on the north, Hiuen Tsang locates a vast kingdom called Tsao-ku-ta or Tsao-li. This may be identified with the country which is referred to by Arab geographers as Zabul or Zabulistan, and comprised the upper valley of the Helmand river, and a large extent of territory both to the east as well as to the west of it. Numismatic evidence shows that some powerful rulers flourished in this region in the seventh century A.D. They used the old title Shāhi, and one of them, Shāhi Tigin, calls himself lord of 'India and Persia' or more properly of 'Takan and Khurāsān'. Another, Śrī Vasudeva, calls himself king of Zaulistan and Multan. The coins of these two kings contain legends both in Indian and Pahlavi characters, and from a comparison with the coins of Khusrū Parver of Persia. Shāhi Tigin may be placed at the beginning and Vasudeva in the middle of the seventh century A.D. Coins of several other kings, some of them containing the word Zaulistan, have been found in the Indus valley, and although it is not possible to construct a detailed history, there is hardly any doubt that a separate kingdom flourished there with a long line of powerful kings. The province of Khurāsān formed a bone of contention between this kingdom and Persia, and it formed something like a buffer state between Indian dominions proper and the Persian empire.¹ Hiuen Tsang also describes the kingdom as above 7000 li in circuit.

¹ I am indebted to Dr. H. C. Roy Chaudhury for the suggestion that Tsao-kuts may be the same as Zabulistan. The variant form Tsao-li may be easily taken as equivalent to Zauli. For Tsao-Ku-ta or Tsao-li cf. Watters, vol. ii, p. 285. For a detailed account of the coins, cf. Cunningham—'Coins of the Indo-Sythians.'

For a detailed geographical account of Zabulistan, cf. Chap. III, f.n. 9.

Hiuen Tsang has fortunately left us some account of the races of people that inhabited these kingdoms and their culture.

The king of Kāpīśī was an Indian, Kshatriya by caste, but the language and literature of the people bore affinity to those of the Turks. Their culture and civilization were not of a very high order though both Buddhism and Brahmanism flourished.¹ Lamghan, Udyāna, Na-ko-lo-ho, Gāndhāra and Bannu were mainly Indian in language, literature and religion.² The language of Tsao-ku-ta or Tsao-li seems to have been somewhat different and the religion of the people was a mixture of animism, Buddhism and Brahmanism.³

The kingdom of Sind and its three dependencies were Indian in language and culture, and very nearly the same was true of Lang-kie-lo which bordered on Persia. The pilgrim says about this country 'The letters are much the same as those of India : their language is a little different There are some hundred saṅghārāmas . . . (and) several hundred Deva temples'.⁴

In the biography of Hiuen Tsang also we are told 'From this (Lang-kie-lo), going north-west we come to the country of Po-la-see which is not within the boundaries of India'⁵. This also implies that in the opinion of the pilgrim, Lang-kie-lo was included within the boundaries of India.

Judged by the test of language and culture, the western boundary of India, as described by Hiuen Tsang, may thus be roughly delineated by an imaginary line drawn from Kandahar to Kabul and then extended north-east right up to the Hindu Kush, and south-west along the boundaries of Baluchistan to the sea-coast. That part of the hilly country in the north which lies between this line and the Hindu Kush mountains was still politically a part of India being ruled with other Indian states by an Indian chief who originally dwelt at Ohind on the Indus. But the population had a strong admixture of Turkish element, due no doubt to the invasions of the Śakas, Kushāṇas and Hūṇas. The chief who ruled over Kāpīśī in the time

¹ Watters, vol. i, p. 123.

² Hiuen Tsang treats them definitely as belonging to India and does not refer to any difference in language.

³ Watters, vol. ii, p. 264.

⁴ Beal, vol. ii, p. 277.

⁵ Beal—*Life of Hiuen Tsang*, 150.

of Hiuen Tsang was traditionally believed to be descended from the Kushānas, and if this is true, the fact that Hiuen Tsang refers to him as Kshatriya furnishes a striking evidence of the absorption of the foreign elements in the Hindu society.

Thus the natural boundary of India to the north-west, viz. the Hindu Kush mountains still remained the political and cultural boundary although an Indianized Turkish element was introduced therein by the Śakas, Hunas and the Kushānas. In the south-west also, the territory corresponding to modern Baluchistan which, as we have seen above, formed politically a part of India, was Indian in language and culture.¹

As to the general character of the hilly tribes in the border-land of civilized areas things have not probably changed much since Hiuen Tsang's day except that they now profess Islamic faith instead of Buddhism. The following description of Hiuen Tsang about the people on the western border of Sind might perhaps be applied to many other groups of people in the same region.

'Among the low marshes near the Sin-tu (Indus) for above 1,000 li were settled some myriads of families of ferocious disposition who made the taking of life their occupation, and supported themselves by rearing cattle; they had no social distinctions and no government; they shaved off their hair and wore the *Bhikkhu garb*, looking like Bhikkhus yet living in the world; they were bigoted in their narrow views and reviled the "Great Vehicle". According to local accounts the ancestors of this people were originally cruel and wicked, and were converted by a compassionate *arhat* who received them into the Buddhist communion; they therefore ceased to take life, shaved their heads and assumed the dress of Buddhist mendicants; in the course of time, however, the descendants of these men had gone back to their old ways but they still remained outwardly Bhikshus.'²

Thus, about the time of the rise of Islamic power, three kingdoms which may be roughly described as Kabul (Kāpiśi), Zabul, and Sind formed the western boundary of India, which extended up to Makrān and Khurāsān. This view about the western border-land of India is also confirmed by early Muhammadan writers. Thus Al-Mas'ūdī

¹ This conclusion is corroborated by Balādhuri as will appear in the course of our narrative.

² Watters—vol. ii, pp. 252-253.

(A.D. 10th cent.) refers to Kandahar as part of Sind¹ while Al-Balādhuri refers to Kish, which is to the south-west of Kandahar, as belonging to the land of al-Hind.² Al-Mas'ūdī further says that India extends on the side of the mountains to Khurāsān.³ Thus both these writers regard the region round Kabul and Kandahar as part of India. 'In a map of the 10th century A.D. given in the "Kitābu-l Masālik wa-l Mamālik" of Ibn Haukal the Hirmand is styled "the river of Hind and Sind".' It also states that Kabul is a Province of Hind.⁴

Alberuni refers to the boundaries of India in the following lines: 'In the western frontier mountains of India there live various tribes of the Afghans, and extend up to the neighbourhood of the Sindh Valley. . . The coast of India begins with Tiz, the capital of Makrán. . . .'⁵ In his account of the towns of India, Alberuni includes both Kabul and Ghazna.⁶ The Arab Geographers generally refer to Kandahar as belonging to India or on the Indian frontier.⁷

CHAPTER II

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE EARLY ARAB RAIDS

In spite of the abundance of historical texts regarding the early history of Islam, authentic references to early Muhammadan raids on India are suprisingly few. The only historical work which professes to give a connected account of the various expeditions is that of Al-Balādhuri.⁸ It chronicles the main incidents without always giving

¹ Elliot—History of India, vol. i, p. 22. ² vol. ii, p. 143. ³ vol. i, p. 20.

⁴ Raverty—Notes on Afghanistan, p. 64.

⁵ Chap. XVIII, vol. i, p. 208.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 206.

⁷ Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 347.

⁸ The full title of the book is 'Kitab Futūḥ al-Bulāḥ' and the full name of the author is 'Ahmad ibn Yahya ibn-Jābir al-Balādhuri.' A critical account of the author is given in the Introduction to the first volume of the English translation of the work by Dr. Philip Khuri Hitti (Columbia University, 1916). The Indian conquests are narrated in the second volume of English Translation of Dr. Francis Clark Murgotten. Elliot translated extracts from this work and gave some account of previous notices of it in his *History of India* (vol. i, p. 22 ff. I have followed Murgotten's Translation. All references to Balādhuri should be understood to refer to this book. No. 1111 in the Dept. of the University of Persian in the Dacca University, kindly advised the English translation and suggested some changes which I have incorporated.

precise dates or details, but the approximate dates of most of them can be ascertained from the context.

The other original historical texts can merely be used for supplementing or checking Al-Baládhuri's account. Among these may be mentioned Aṭ-Ṭabari and Khulasat-ul-Akbar. The former has been utilized by Weil in his 'Geschichte des Chalifen (Mannheim 1846-50)' and all relevant passages from the latter have been quoted by Major David Price in his valuable work 'Chronological retrospect (or Memoirs of the Principal events of Muhammadan history from the death of the Arabian legislator to the accession of the Emperor Akbar' published in 1811.¹

In addition to these there are various other modern works² on the early history of Islam, but they hardly contain any new information about the Muhammadan raids on India. This evidently shows that not much of historical importance regarding this episode has been discovered among the many Arabic and Persian works that have since come to light. For the history of the Muhammadan conquest of Sind, however, we possess a detailed account in Chach-náma.³ This is a Persian translation of an old Arabic history of the conquest of Sind by the Arabs. The Persian translation was made about A.D. 1216 by Ali Kúfí, who got the original Arabic manuscript from the Kazi of Alor, a member of the same Sakifí tribe to which belonged

¹ In addition to the three original texts named above, stray references occur in other original historical texts of later date, such as e.g. *Taríkh-i-Guzidá*. The conquest of Sind is, of course, referred to in many later works.

² The following books deserve special notice :—

1. J. Welhausen ... Das Arabische Reich.
Und sein Sturz (Berlin, 1902).
2. G. Van Vloten ... Recherches Sur la domination.
Arabe (Amsterdam, 1894).
3. A. Müller ... Der Islam im Morgen und Abendland.
(2 vols.) Berlin, 1885.
4. Sedillot ... Histoires des Arabes.
(2 vols.) 2nd Edition, Paris, 1877.
5. Muir ... Annals of the Early Caliphate, from
original sources. (Smith and Elder 1883).
6. Elliot ... The History of India. (Vols. I, II.)

³ I have used the English translation of the work by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg (Karachi, 1900)—but the important passages quoted in this paper have been carefully compared with the original text (with the help of the copy of the Manuscript in the possession of the Asiatic Society of Bengal) by my friend Dr. Muhammad Sahidulla.

the famous Muhammad ibn Kásim, the conqueror of Sind. This circumstance no doubt explains the fact as stated by the Kazi, 'that an account of this conquest (of Sind) had been written in the Arabic language by his ancestors in a manuscript which had been handed down as a heritage from one to another to his time'.

Although there is no means to determine the time when the original Arabic history was written, its importance as the earliest detailed account of the kingdom of Sind and its conquest by the Arabs cannot be over-estimated. Leaving aside the usual parables, maxims, verses and romantic stories, the book contains a kernel of historical facts which are substantially corroborated by more authentic historical texts such as those of Al-Baládhuri. The data supplied by it must, no doubt, be accepted with great caution, but they may be used as auxiliary evidence, specially when they are not inherently improbable in themselves nor contradictory to known historical facts.

The Arab conquest of Sind is also described in some detail in two later works viz., (1) *Tárikhu-s Sind* by Mir Muhammad M'asúm (also called *Tárikh-i M'asúmi*) composed in A.D. 1600¹ and (2) *Tuhfatu-l Kirám* by Alí Sher Káni which was completed in A.D. 1767-8 or a few years later.²

Both these works merely give a summary of *Chach-náma* in describing the Arab conquest of Sind. But on some important dates and details they give a different version from the existing text of *Chach-náma*. It will be shown later that some of these dates are more reliable than those found in the present text of *Chach-náma* which are obviously wrong.

CHAPTER III

RAIDS AGAINST KÁBUL AND ZÁBULISTÁN

The first shock of Muhammadan invasions was equally felt by the three great border kingdoms of Kábul, Zábul and Sind. For the sake of clear understanding we shall discuss the topic under two heads: (1) Raids against Kábul and Zábulistán, and (2) Expeditions against Sind.

The incidents in connection with the first are mainly to be gathered from the accounts of Al-Baládhuri occasionally supplemented by other

¹ Elliot—i, pp. 212 ff.

² Elliot—i, pp. 327 ff.

sources. The following bald summary of events may be offered as the result of a careful perusal of all available authorities.

In the year A.H. 28 or 29 (A.D. 649-50) 'Abdallāh ibn 'Āmir' a young enterprising military chief was appointed governor of Al-Basrah by the Caliph Uthman. 'Abdallāh made some conquest in the land of Fars (a province in the south-east of Persia), raided Khurāsān and advanced up to the Oxus. (pp 159 ff).² While proceeding from Fars to Khurāsān, in the year 30, he deputed one of his lieutenants ar-Rabi on to Sijistān (p. 141). Ar-Rabi made various conquests in the neighbourhood of Zarah Lake and ultimately besieged Zaranj which capitulated on terms. Ar-Rabi remained at Zaranj (p. 143) for two years and was then succeeded by 'Abd-ar-Rahmān ibn-Samurah as the governor of Sijistān. The new governor is said to have established his rule over every thing between 'Zaranj and Kishsh of the land of al-Hind, and over that part of the region of the road of ar-Rukkhaj which is between it and the province of ad-Dāwar' (p. 143).

This is the first mention of India in the narrative of Muslim conquests as given by al-Balādhuri and as such the passage requires careful scrutiny. It is apparent, as already noted above, that Kishsh was regarded as the first city on the frontier of India by the writer of the passage.

Fortunately, the topography of the locality is fairly well-known and the identification of the places mentioned is not a difficult task. Le Strange has made a critical geographical study of these in the *Lands of Eastern Caliphate*³ and his conclusions, so far as they relate to the subject under discussion, may be summed up below.

'The broad valley, down which the Helmund flows from the mountains of Hindu Kush to Bust, still bears the name, Zamīn-Dāwar, the Persian form, of which the Arabic equivalent is "*Ar-Rūd-d-Dāwar*" "the Land of the Gates".⁴

'Half-way along the remaining course of the Helmund, from *Bust* to *Zaranj*, stands the town of Rūdbār, the *Ar-Rūdābār* of Balādhuri;

¹ I have not thought it necessary to repeat the long titles of the Arab chiefs as given by Balādhuri, but have merely given the first part.

² The page references within brackets are to Murgotten's translation of Balādhuri, vol. ii.

³ Le Strange—*The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge, 1905.

⁴ p. 345.

made a brave sortie. Unfortunately an elephant that was killed at the battle fell just at the gate from which they issued, so that they could not close it and the Muslims entered the city by force. A treaty was concluded—on what terms we do not know—but it was shortly broken and Kábul had to be conquered a second time (pp. 146–47).¹

From Kábul the conqueror proceeded against Zábulistán.² By this term, the Arabs meant particularly the country around Ghazni though

¹ Raverty gives a somewhat different account of this conquest of Kábul on p. 62 of '*Notes on Afghanistan and part of Baluchistan*'. He writes :

In 43 A.H. (A.D. 663–64), the Arabs invaded the territory of Kábul, under 'Abd-ur-Rahmán, son of Sumrah, who was the lieutenant of Abd-ullah, son of Amír, governor of Khurásán. He marched from Sijistán after capturing the capital of that country. Kábul Sháh, at that period, was known by the title or name of Arij; but this appears to be an Arabic word, and signifies lameness from birth. He moved out, with his forces to meet the Musalmán invaders, and after a severe battle, retired within the walls of Kábul, and did not sally out again. Abd-ur-Rahmán continued before it for a full year, after which, his army having suffered great hardship and fatigues, the place was taken. The fighting men were put to the sword, and the women and children were made captives. The Kábul Sháh was also taken, and his head was ordered to be struck off, but he was spared on his agreeing to become a convert to Islám. He was then received into favour, a tribute was fixed, and the Musalmáns retired'.

Raverty does not indicate his source of information about this detailed campaign, but it is evidently based on *Turjuma-i-futuh* of Ahmad bin Asmi Kufi, quoted by Dowson (Elliot, vol. ii, p. 414 f. n. 1). It is not certain whether the account refers to the first or the second conquest of Kábul. The latter seems more probable.

In connection with the Muslim conquest of Kábul, Baládhuri makes a very interesting statement which deserves more than a passing notice—'Abd-ur-Rahmán', says he, 'took with him to al-Basrah, slaves captured at Kábul, and they built him a mosque in his castle there after the Kábul style of building' (p. 147). The fact that one of the earliest mosques to be built at an important centre of Islam was modelled after Kabuli style of building, is full of importance for the history of the origin of Saracenic style. But this topic being only of secondary importance in the present discussion, cannot be treated any further here.

² Both Elliot and Raverty, and following them, other scholars, have accepted the view that both Kábul and Zábul denoted one and the same kingdom under Ratbil. This erroneous conception has confused their entire account of the Muhammadan raids in Sijistán and Kábul. A careful perusal of Baládhuri leaves no doubt that Zábulistan was clearly distinguished from Kábul. Thus, describing the victories of 'Abd-ur-Rahmán, he mentions separately the conquest of Kábul and Zábulistan (p. 147). Then describing the subsequent discomfiture of the Muslim army, the same author says: 'Then Kábul Sháh assembled a force to oppose the Muslims and drove out all of them that were in Kábul. And Ratbil came and gained control of Dhábulistan (or Zábulistan) and ar-Rukkhaj as far as Bust'. (p. 147). Again, Baládhuri clearly distinguishes the two when he says that Ratbil sent to him ('Ubaidallah) asking for peace for his own country and the land of Kábul (p. 148). Again, it is said with reference to al-Mamun that he

it was applied vaguely to denote the whole of the great mountainous district of the upper waters of the Helmund and the Kandahar rivers. As already noted before, 'Abd-ar-Rahmán, during the first period of his governorship, had entered into an agreement with this country. But the inhabitants had broken it and now attacked the Arabs. They were, however, defeated (p. 147).

'Abd-ar-Rahmán was superseded by ar-Rabí ibn-Ziyád, and died in the year 50 A.H. (A.D. 670).

The removal of 'Abd-ar-Rahmán emboldened the chiefs of Kabul and Zabulistan to throw off the Muslim yoke. The king of Kabul 'drove out all the Muslims from Kábul'¹, and Ratbil² (apparently a title of the kings of Zábulistan, by which they are referred to in Arab History) came and gained control of Zábulistan and ár-Rukkhaj as far as Bust. 'Ar-Rabi, the Arab governor, attacked him at Bust, put him to flight, and pursued him until he reached ar-Rukkhaj. After attacking him in ar-Rukkhaj, ar-Rabi continued to advance and subdued the city of ad-Dáwar.' Ubaidallah who succeeded 'Ar-Rabí as governor of Sijistán continued the campaign and reached Razan

collected double the tribute from Ratbil, but he subdued Kábul whose king promised obedience.'

No reasonable doubt can thus be entertained that the two formed separate kingdoms. They often formed an alliance against their common foe, the Muslims, and this no doubt explains their long resistance to the powerful arms of Islam. It may be noted here that Raverty admits that Kabul and Zabul are distinct places and should not be confused with each other (*Notes on Afghanistan*, p. 61).

As to the geographical position of Zabulistan we can have no better guide than Le Strange whose conclusion is based upon accounts of early Muslim writers. According to him 'The highlands of the Kandahar country, along the upper waters of the Helmund, were known as Zabulistan' (p. 334). Le Strange further remarks :

'As we have seen, the whole of the great mountainous district of the upper waters of the Helmund and the Kandahar rivers was known to the Arabs as Zábulistan, a term of vague application, but one which more particularly denoted the country round Ghaznah. On the other hand, Kábulistan was the Kábul country, lying more to the north on the frontiers of Bamiyan' (p. 349).

¹ Mr. Fida Ali Khan translates the passage : 'sallied forth with all those [i.e. all his available army] from Kabul.'

² The name Ratbil has numerous variants. Elliot observes : 'Nevertheless there is no certainty as to the proper mode of spelling the name. The various readings of the European authors who have noticed him, show how little the orthography is settled. Ockley calls him 'Zentil'; Weil, 'Zenbil'; Reinaud, 'Ratbyl' and 'Zenbyl'. Wilson, 'Rateil, Ratpeil, Ratbal, Rantal, Zantil—variations easily accounted for by the nature of the Persian letters'. E. Thomas, 'Ratpîl', Price, 'Reteil', 'Ratteil', or 'Ratpeil'. (Vol. II, p. 417.)

when Ratbil concluded with him a treaty of peace for his own country and the land of Kábul. As regards the terms we are simply told that the peace was established on the payment of 1 million *dirhams*.¹

But the peace was short-lived. Towards the end of the reign of Caliph Yazid (64 A.H. — A.D. 683) Kábul revolted once more and imprisoned Abu-'Ubaidah ibn-Ziyád. Yazid ibn-Ziyád, the governor of Sijistán, proceeded against Kábul and a great battle took place at Junzah. But the Muslim army was completely routed. The governor himself and some distinguished members of the aristocracy lay dead on the field and the rest fled. Abu-'Ubaidah had to be ransomed for 500,000 dirhams.

Ratbil fomented and aided rebellions in the Arab domain of Sijistán where the people expelled the Arab governor. 'Ratbil soon declared war against the Arabs' and apparently proceeded nearly as far as Zarah lake, for we are told that the new governor 'was compelled to stop in the city of Zaranj.' But Ratbil was killed and his soldiers were put to rout (A.D. 685).²

¹ Baládhurí (p. 210) refers to a border raid in 44 A.H. by Al-Muhallab in course of which he passed through Baunah and Al-Ahwar, towns between Multan and Kábul, and reached al-Kikán. Baunah seems to be the same as Bannu and Al-Ahwar was probably a neighbouring town. As regards the result of the raid, Baládhurí simply says that 'the enemy met and attacked him and his followers'. Evidently Muhallab did not achieve any success.

Ferishta, as usual, gives an exaggerated account and takes Muhallab to Multan. Elliot goes one step further and identifies Al-Ahwar with Lahore. These presumptions are absolutely without any basis and may be dismissed as incredible. It may be doubted whether the city of Lahore existed at that time, at least under the present name. The objective of Muhallab's raid was al-Kikán, and both Multan and Lahore were far away from the route. Elliot (Vol. II, p. 415) gives some details of 'Abd-ar-Rahmān's campaign against Kábul, apparently on the authority of Baládhurí. But the text translated by Murgotten does not give these details.

² Elliot apparently refers to this episode (vol. II, p. 416) when he says :—

'In 61 A.H. — 683-4 A.D., 'Abdu-l-'Aziz, the governor of Sístán, declared war against the king of Kábul and in the combat which took place, that king was defeated and killed. The war continued under his successor and he was compelled to submit to the payment of tribute, but whenever opportunity offered, renewed efforts were made by the Kábulis to recover their lost independence'.

But Elliot confuses it with the campaign of 61 A.H. Besides, this campaign of 'Abdu-l-'Aziz was directed not against Kábul but against Ratbil, king of Sijistán. As noted above, in f.n. 2, on page 16 the presumption that Kábul and Zábul formed one kingdom under Ratbil, has vitiated the account of Elliot.

The passage is translated as follows by Murgotten: 'Abd-al-'Aziz 'was compelled to stop in the city Zaranj because Ratbil was at war with him' (p. 149). The passage is translated differently by Mr. Fida Ali Khan. According to him it means 'he was allowed to enter the city and attacked Ratbil'.

The war was, however, continued by Ratbil II, the son and successor of the late chief. He did not oppose the advance of the Muhammadans till they penetrated deep into his country. Then he blocked the mountain paths and passes, and forced the Muhammadan general 'Abdalláh to conclude a treaty on easy terms.' The Caliph 'Abd-al-Malik however, disapproved of the treaty and dismissed 'Abdalláh (p. 150).

Shortly after Al-Hajjáj became governor of Irak (A.D. 695), his general 'Ubaidalláh made an attempt to subdue Kábul. Here, too, his enemy blocked the mountain path and Ratbil soon joined them. 'Ubaidalláh was ready to extricate himself from this difficult position by offering easy terms to his opponents, but Shuraih ibn-Hání al-Háarithi dissuaded him from this course, saying 'Fear Allah and fight this people, for if thou doest what thou art about to do, thou wilt weaken Islam on this frontier'. So 'a battle ensued and Shuraih made a charge, but was killed. The army fought their way out, although hard pressed, and made their way along the desert of Bust. Many of the men perished of thirst and hunger, and 'Ubaidalláh died of grief for what he had brought upon his men and the fate that had overtaken them.' (p. 151).

It was a veritable disaster for the Muslim forces and its subsequent effect convulsed the whole Islamic world. Al-Baládhuri briefly passes over this unfortunate episode. But other sources give more details. It appears that the Muslim forces were allowed to retire only on the payment of a humiliating ransom.² To avenge the

¹ According to this treaty, 'Abdalláh agreed, on payment of 300,000 dirhams, not to raid in future the kingdom of Ratbil. It was in the nature of a *Chazf* exacted by the Mahrattas, in later ages.

² Cf. for example the passage from *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*, quoted by Elliot (vol. I, p. 416): 'Ranbal, retiring before his assailant, detached troops to their rear and blocking up the defiles, entirely intercepted their retreat, and in this manner exposed to the danger of perishing by famine, 'Abdulla was compelled to purchase the liberation of himself and followers for a ransom of seven hundred thousand dirhams'.

Raverty evidently follows the same authority and adds to the account that it is said that, when his ('Ubaidullah's) wearied and half-starved troops reached Musalman ground and their own people brought forth food and relieved their necessities, many eat their fill and fell down dead immediately after. (See *Notes on Afghanistan*, p. 62). Raverty gives the name as 'Abdullah' which agrees with that of Baládhuri. Elliot spells it as Abdulla. Both the *Notes* (698-99 A.D.) as the date of the event. Cf. *Price*, vol. I, p. 416. The *Khullassut-ul-Akbar*, which substantially agrees with the above.

affront an army was raised, named the 'peacock army', so splendidly was it equipped at the cost of a heavy war-cess on Al-Basra and Al-Kufa. The command was placed in the hands of 'Abd-ar-Rahmán ibn-Muhammad ibn-al-Ash'ath who marched against Ratbil in 80 A.H. (A.D. 699) put him to flight and ravaged his land. The commander, mindful of the recent reverses, wanted to proceed cautiously; but Al-Hajjáj, upbraiding him with faint-heartedness, peremptorily bade him fight on, and when the commander expostulated with him, threatened his supersession. The army, as well as its commander, strongly resented the action. 'Abd-ar-Rahmán made favourable terms with Ratbil, and declaring war both against Al-Hajjáj and the Caliph, marched on Al-Írák, and captured Al-Basra. The rebellion having assumed serious proportions, the Caliph took alarm and offered terms to the rebels. 'Abd-ar-Rahmán was inclined to accept the offer, which included supersession of Al-Hajjáj, but the rebel army rejected it. At last a great battle was fought in 82 A.H. (A.D. 701-702) and 'Abd-ar-Rahmán was signally defeated by Al-Hajjáj. Pursued by the latter 'Abd-ar-Rahmán was again beaten on the Persian border and took refuge with Ratbil, who a year or two afterwards sent his head to Al-Hajjáj.¹ He is said to have died or committed suicide.

¹ Elliot vol. ii, p. 416. Price, (vol. i, pp. 455-463). On the authority of Khulassat-ul-Akbar. *Muir-Caliphate*, p. 336. Strangely enough, Baládhúr passes over the whole episode though he refers to the rebellion of 'Abd-ar-Rahmán, and his tragic end.

Raverty gives interesting details, but, as usual, does not indicate his authority. He says that 'Abd-ur-Rahmán, after prolonged fight with Hajjáj, was compelled to fly in 81 A.H. (700-1 A.D.) and took shelter within the walls of Bust, which was held by one of his own subordinates named 'Iyáz. Raverty then continues :

'He ('Iyáz) seized and imprisoned 'Abd-ur-Rahmán and proposed to send him to Hajjáj. Zantbil (i.e. Ratbil) immediately on hearing of this marched his force to Bust and infested it on all sides and threatened 'Iyáz and all within the place with impalement if a hair of the head of 'Abd-ur-Rahmán should be injured, and that he would never leave the place until he should be released. This had the desired effect, and he was set at liberty, and took refuge with Zantbil (Ratan-pal?). Hajjáj sometime after sent an agent to that ruler making him very advantageous offers and requiring him to give up 'Abd-ur-Rahmán, which he did, along with eighteen of his kinsmen, in the year 82 A.H. (701-2 A.D.), but on the road back, 'Abd-ur-Rahmán succeeded in throwing himself from the flat roof of a building in which they had alighted to rest, and dragged the agent with him. Both perished' (Raverty op. cit., p. 63).

This episode, if true, throws interesting light on the powers and magnanimity of Ratbil.

According to Al-Baládhuri, Ratbil betrayed him from fear of Al-Hajjáj, because the latter had written a threatening letter. Thereupon 'Abd-ar-Rahmán threw himself from the top of a cliff (p. 151).

Ratbil did not fail to take full advantage of the internal split in the Muslim world,¹ and concluded a favourable treaty with al-Hajjáj. The latter agreed not to make war upon him for 7 (or 9) years on condition of an annual subsidy in kind. This arrangement continued till the death of Al-Hajjáj (A.D. 714) inspite of occasional disputes over the value of the goods paid as subsidy in which Ratbil always scored against his enemy (p. 152).

When, in the Caliphate of Sulaimán, Yazíd became governor of Irák in 96 A.H. (A.D. 715) and his brother Mudrik, governor of Sijistán, Ratbil refused to pay any tribute at all. He was evidently encouraged by the confusion which prevailed in the Muslim world during the last days of the Umayyids. For more than forty years, the Muhammadans could not exact anything from him. (pp. 152-3).

It was not till the establishment of the Abbassids, that the Muhammadans could renew their offensive. During the Caliphate of Al-Mansúr (A.D. 754-775), Kandahar was conquered (p. 231) and the Muhammadan governor of Sijistán again demanded tribute from Ratbil (apparently Ratbil III or IV). The latter sent some camels, tents and slaves, reckoning each at double its value. The governor Ma'n became angry and declared war against Ratbil. He overran ar-Rukhkhaj and secured many captives, but Ratbil was far from being subdued.² For we are told that during the next three Caliphates, the Muslim officers collected tribute from Ratbil of Sijistán 'as well as they could', (or, according to a different rendering,

¹ We learn from Tabari that in the year 90 A.H. (A.D. 709) Ratbil agreed to aid the Maliks of Balkh, Marw-ar-Rúd, Tál-Kán, Fáryáb, and the Gúzgánán against Katibah, son of Musallam-ul-Bahili (Raverty, op. cit., p. 63; Price, Vol. I, p. 469).

² Baládhuri says (p. 154) that after the campaign, Mawand, the lieutenant of Ratbil, asked for safe-conduct in order to be taken to the Commander of the Believers. Ma'n granted it sending him to Baghdad with 5,000 soldiers, and Al-Mansúr treated him generously, 'pensioning him and his chieftains', (or according to the translation of Mr. Fida Ali Khan 'fixing an allowance for him and appointing him a military commander').

It is possible that some understanding was arrived at regarding the payment of tribute in future.

'according to their strength or weakness') which certainly does not mean much.¹

When the Caliph al-Ma'mún (A.D. 813-833) visited Khurásán, Ratbil paid double tribute to him, but was evidently left unmolested. Al-Ma'mun, however, sent an army against Kábul, probably the Shahi ruler of Kábul, who submitted to taxation and acknowledged obedience. Baládhuri further says that the king of Kábul professed Islam and promised obedience, but he apparently regained independence and apostatized almost immediately after.²

Next we hear of the conquest of Kábul and Zábulistan by Ya'kúb, son of Lais about A.D. 870. The king of Kábul was made a prisoner while the king of Zábulistan was killed and its inhabitants forced to embrace Islam. Henceforth, Zábulistan ceased to belong to India, either politically or culturally, but Kábul recovered its independence and remained, as before, a part of India from both political and cultural point of view till the time of the Turkish Sultans of Ghazni.³

We may now sum up the results of these early Muhammadan raids. During the period of 50 years that elapsed since the first raid in 28 A.H. (A.D. 649) we may distinguish three periods of alternate success and failure. The first period of 7 years ended with the Caliphate of Uthman (A.D. 656). In spite of a promising beginning, the Islamic forces achieved very little during this period. During the second period, renewed efforts were made by the Caliphs 'Ali and Mu-áwiya, and, thanks to the brilliant skill and energy of 'Abd-ar-

¹ Baládhuri, p. 155. Price refers to an expedition against Kabul in 107 A.H. (A.D. 725-6) during the Caliphate of Hisham (Vol. I, p. 567). Raverty refers to two expeditions against Kabul, in 152 A.H. (A.D. 769) and 170 A.H. (A.D. 785-7). But none of these achieved any substantial results. Possibly, Kabul fortified its position by an alliance with China and Kashmir. That the Arabs could not make any impression in Afghanistan about this time also follows from the itinerary of Oukong (*Journal Asiatique*, 1895, part II, pp. 348 ff. pp. 381 ff.

² Baládhuri, pp. 155, 203.

As to the king of Kábul's accepting Islam and promising obedience, the Arab accounts repeat it too often to be taken seriously. It seems that the Islamic creed and political subordination sat very lightly upon that ruler and he always took the earliest opportunity to throw off the yoke and apostatize. There are good grounds to believe that that was also the case on this occasion. In any case we find again an independent Hindu ruler in Kábul at later times.

³ Raverty, op. cit., p. 63; Elliot, Vol. II, p. 419.

Rahmān ibn-Samurah, Islamic forces obtained notable successes against the rulers of Kābul and Zābulistan. The removal and death of 'Abd-ar-Rahmān in 50 A.H. (670 A.D.) ushered in the third period of nearly 30 years in which the Islamic arms sustained serious reverses, both in Kābul and Zābulistan, which had their repercussion on the whole Muslim world. The fruitless efforts of half a century (A.D. 649-700) convinced the Arabs that the conquest of these territories was beyond their power. Henceforth they were glad to leave them alone and merely sought to impose some sort of suzerainty upon them. But even this was with difficulty maintained for a very brief period (A.D. 700-14). For the next century and a half, Kābul and Zābul maintained their authority practically unimpaired. The Abbassid Caliphs, no doubt, occasionally exacted some tributes from them, but with the exception of this and occasional raids, Kābul and Zābul were left undisturbed till the former was conquered by Ya'kūb, son of Lais, in A.D. 870.

CHAPTER IV.

THE KINGDOM OF SIND ON THE EVE OF THE MUHAMMADAN CONQUEST

Although the three border-kingdoms of Kābul, Zābul and Sind had all to bear the brunt of the first Muhammadan invasion, the wars with Sind were more prolonged and led to more permanent results. And of the kingdom of Sind alone it is possible to give some detailed account for the period immediately preceding the Muhammadan raids. For this we are indebted to the well-known work *Chach-nāma* already referred to above. The *Chach-nāma* begins with an account of king Sahiras, son of Sahasi Rai. His dominions are said to have 'extended on the east to the boundary of Kashmir, on the west to Makrān, on the south to the coast of the sea and Debal, and on the north to the mountains of Kurdan and Kíkánán'.¹ The central part of these

¹ In the *Tārīkh-i-M'asūmī* and the *Tuhfatul Kirā'm*, the boundaries given are as follows: 'On the east, Kashmir and Kanauj; on the west, Makran, Debal (Lahore in M'asūmīs) and the sea-shore of Oman; on the north, Kandhār, Sistān, the Suleiman mountains and the Kíkánán Hills; and on the south, the sea-port of Surat.' (Ch^o. p. 11 f.n.).

territories was under the immediate charge of the king with his capital at Alor and the rest was divided into four provinces, each under a governor,¹ with headquarters respectively at Bahmanábád, Siwistán, Iskandah and Multan. The king, however, lost his life in a fight with the king of Nimruz, a province of Persia, who had invaded his territory and entered Kirmán. According to *Tuhfatu-l-Kirám*, the battle took place near Kich.

Rai Sáhasi II,² son of Sahiras, then ascended the throne and ruled over the entire kingdom. During his reign, a poor Brāhmaṇa named Chach,³ gradually rose to power and high office, and after his master's death, secured the throne for himself. He married the widowed queen and had two sons by her, *viz.*, Daharsiah and Dáhar, and a daughter Báí.

The provincial governors at first refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of the usurper. Chach marched in person against Iskandah and Multan and subdued them. He then proceeded further up to the hills of Kashmir and definitely fixed the frontier between the two kingdoms. Chach next proceeded against the governors of Siwistán and Bahmanábád and subdued them.⁴

¹ In Ch° (p. 25) the four governors are referred to as four tributary rulers and it appears that their status was much higher than that of an ordinary governor. The ruler of Multan, Bachchera, e.g. was a near relation of Sáhasi (p. 27). The governor of Siwistán is called a king and a son of a king (p. 31-2). He conspires against king of Sind (39-40).

² Not much information is given of the dynasty which ended with Rai Sáhasi II. It is said (Ch°, p. 20-21) that Maharat, king of Chitor, was the brother of Rai Sáhasi, and on the death of the latter, he marched towards Alor with an army and sent the following message to Chach ':

'I am the rightful heir to this kingdom, and this country is the property of my fathers and grandfathers. It is but right that I should have for my own my brother's heritage.'

King Maharat was, however, defeated and killed by Chach.

According to *Tuhfatu l Kirám*, this event took place in 1 A.H., and the dynasty overthrown by Chach ruled for 137 years (A.D. 485-622). It consisted of the following kings: Dewaij, Sáhiras I, Sáhasi I, Sáhiras II, Sáhasi II, each being the son of his predecessor.

In Chach-náma, Sáhiras' father, the senior Rai Sáhasi i.e. Sáhasi I, is said to be son of Dewaij (p. 25). Apparently, there is some confusion about the genealogy. But there is no justification for Cunningham's assumption that 'Diwaj II was the father of Sahirás (or Siharas)'. (Later Indo-Scythians, p. 105.)

³ For a discussion of the various forms of the name and the caste to which he belonged, cf. Elliot, Vol. I, pp. 409 ff.

⁴ See Appendix Geographical Note A, for full details.

Having thus settled affairs at home, Chach wanted to take advantage of the confusion in the Persian kingdom to extend his territory in that direction. He passed through and subdued a portion of Makrán, and fixed the western limits of his kingdom at a stream that separated Kirmán from Makrán. Then Chach marched towards Kandábil and its people agreed to pay an annual tribute.¹

Chach died at Alor after a reign of 40 years,² and was succeeded by his brother Chandar who ruled for 7 years. The death of Chandar was followed by an internal split. Dáhar, the younger son of Chach, sat on the throne at Alor, while Duráj, son of Chandar, established himself at Bahmanábád. But Daharsiah, the elder son of Chach, ousted Duráj after a year and occupied Bahmanábád.³ For the next 30 years, the kingdom was divided between the brothers Dáhar and Daharsiah with headquarters respectively at Alor and Bahmanábád. Then, after Daharsiah's death, the united kingdom came into the possession of Dáhar.⁴ Eight years after this event Dáhar's kingdom was attacked by the neighbouring king of Ramal but Dáhar easily repulsed him.⁵

The dates of these kings may be ascertained from several data supplied by Chach-náma and *Tuhfatu-l-Kirám*. According to the latter, Chach ascended the throne in the year of the Hijrí, *i.e.*, A.D. 622. This is, however, in conflict with the statement in Chach-náma that Chach had already been 35 years on the throne when, in 11 A.H. in the Caliphate of Umar, Mughaira led an expedition to Debal. The year 11 is evidently a mistake, as Umar had not succeeded to the Caliphate till 13 A.H. The expedition, referred to in Chach-náma, took place, according to al-Baládhuri, about 15 A.H. Even assuming this date to be true, Chach's accession falls about A.D. 602. Now the mistake in Hijrí date for Umar, too palpably absurd in a history written by a Muhammadan, and similar other wrong Hijrí dates in the book suggest some mistake in the reading or writing of figures in original copies or transcriptions of the Text of Chach-náma. Besides, the data for the reign-periods of the kings as given in Chach-náma, lend support

¹ See Appendix, Geographical Note A, for full details.

² Ch°, p. 39.

³ Ch°, p. 42.

⁴ Ch°, p. 54.

⁵ Ch°, p. 55. In the *Tuhfatu-l-Kirám*, the invader is said to be Ramalrai, king of Kanauj, and not king of Ramal.

to the date as given in *Tuḥfatul-Kirām*. According to this theory we can arrange the dates as follows:—

Chach	49 years	...	A.D. 622-662
Chandar	7 years	...	„ 662-669
Dāhar } Durāj }	1 year	...	„ 669-670
Dāhar } Daharsiah }	30 years (p. 54)	...	„ 670- 700
Dāhar	8 years ÷ x	,	700-708 ÷ x

Chach-nāma continues the story of Dāhar down to the invasion of the king of Ramal, and then begins his account of the Muslim invasion of Sind. Now the invasion by the king of Ramal took place in the eighth year after Daharsiah's death, (*i.e.*, in A.D. 703) and this brings us to the epoch of the great fight between Dāhar and the Arabs. Thus the theory accepted above, is quite in accordance with the detailed account furnished in Chach-nāma.¹

The Chach-nāma represents Sind as a great and powerful kingdom, extending up to the borders of Kashmir and Kanauj on the north and east and to those of Kirmān in the west. The details scattered in the book, such as the names of towns under different governors, journeys of kings and their victorious expeditions, all corroborate this general picture. Al-Balādhuri states that al-Kīkān (modern Kelat) is part of the land of As-Sind where it borders on Khurāsān.¹²

It must be noted, however, that the solidarity of the kingdom was destroyed in the seventh century A.D. by several incidents.

¹ Elliot's Chronology (Vol. I, pp. 406, 412-414) is somewhat different. He finds inconsistency in *Tuḥfatul-Kirām*'s statements, because while it gives 92 years as the total period of duration, the sumtotal of the reign-periods of the three kings, as given in it, only comes up to 81. Hence Elliot places the accession of Chach in 10 A.H. But the detailed accounts of the reign of the different kings, as given above on the authority of Chach-nāma, really makes the total duration of the dynasty one of 99 years, if we assume Dāhar's death to have taken place in 712 A.D. The 99 solar years of India would correspond very nearly to 92 years of a Muhammadan writer. The real mistake of *Tuḥfatul-Kirām* was perhaps the reign-period of 33 years which is assigned to Dāhar, whereas according to Chach-nāma, he ruled for nearly 43 years. For the first 31 years of this period, he ruled only over a part of Sind, and it was only after Daharsiah's death that he came to be the sole ruler of the country.

² Balādhūri p. 210. For Kīkān see App. Geographical Note A.

First, the usurpation of Chach. It was preceded by the murder of all the nobles of the Court who opposed him and followed by the rebellion of the provincial governors. Though these were quelled with difficulty, Chach sowed the seeds of discontent which overwhelmed his son at no distant date. We shall see later on how important officials of state deserted the son of Chach and joined his Muslim enemy. This might have been inspired in no small degree by their loyalty to the old dynasty which was so basely betrayed by Chach. As a matter of fact, we find that immediately after the death of Chach, one of his governors made a secret plot with the kings of Kashmir and Kanauj with a view to seize the kingdom for himself, and the hostile armies approached the very walls of the capital city.¹

Secondly, the virtual division of the kingdom after the death of Chandar must have weakened the resources of the kingdom by constant conflicts between Alor and Bahmanábád. This internal dissension lasted for more than 30 years, and it was during this period that the Muhammadans were knocking at the gates of Sind.

Thirdly, the kings of Sind were hostile to, and not infrequently at war with, the neighbouring kingdoms of Kashmir, Kanauj and Ramal. Almost at the very moment when Muhammad ibn-Kásim was marching towards Sind, king Dáhar was fighting with the king of Ramal.

Fourthly, the existence of powerful Buddhist monks who wielded great political authority as rulers of districts or owners of strongholds, was a 'positive danger to the Bráhmanical state.'² Many of these

¹ Ch°—pp. 39 ff. Another governor, when attacked by Chach applied for assistance to the king of Kanauj (Ch°, p. 33).

² Various references to the Samanis or Buddhist monks are scattered throughout Ch°. Thus when Chach proceeded against the governor of Bahmanábád, the latter, himself a Buddhist, sought the help of Samani Buddhaji or Buddhakhya (i.e. Buddhagupta or Buddharakshita). Ch° says: 'When Chach had come to know that Agham (the governor) and his son had conspired with the Samanis and that it was owing to his sorcery, enchantments, magic and sorcery, that he was had been prolonged for a year, he had sworn: "If I cannot in thirty days free, I shall seize the Samani, take off his skin, give it to my people to cover drums with it and to beat them till it was time to sleep" (Ch°, pp. 225, 226). Again, the son of Agham was "in the hands of a Buddhist Samani" descended from the agents of Pál Sahas, king of Hindú ... In the however, he had thrown off his yoke and had become an opponent.

Even the important fortress of Nisara (Nisara) was held by Buddhist Samani named Buddhakhya who

Buddhists surrendered their state or strongholds to the Islamic invaders and made alliance with them.

Thus, inspite of the large extent and vast resources of the kingdom of Sind, the internal situation was not quite favourable to a sustained opposition to determined invaders.

CHAPTER V.

THE MUHAMMADAN CONQUEST OF SIND

The early Arab raids were directed against the coast-land of India. From their secure base at Oman, an army was sent across to Tanah, i.e., Thana, near Bombay about 15 A.H. (A.D. 637). Similar expeditions were sent against Barwas or Broach and to the gulf of Ad-Daibul, i.e. Debal. Al-Baládhuri records a Muslim victory at Debal, but is silent about the results of the other two raids. On the other hand, according to Chach-náma, the Muslims were defeated and their leader was killed by the governor of Chach at the battle of Debal.¹ It may be safely concluded that the Muslim arms did not

Muslims even before the Muslim forces achieved any victory (Ch°, p. 72). He is reported to have said to Muhammad ibn-Kásim: 'I myself and all my men are subjects of the Khalífah, and we hold this place subject to the command and in accordance with the terms of the letter of Hajjäg. In fact we owe our permanent position to his help and patronage and encouragement.' There was a secret compact between him and Hajjáj, and he opened the gates of Nerun when Muhammad had besieged it in vain and was in great straits (Ch°, p. 91).

The Buddhist community at Siwistán, another strongly fortified town, forced the ruler to surrender it to the Muslim army, saying, 'We people are a priestly class. According to our faith, fighting and slaughtering are not allowable. We will never be in favour of shedding blood' . . . (Ch°, p. 93.)

The same unpatriotic and treacherous spirit was shown by the Buddhists of other places (Ch°, pp. 105, 173).

¹ Ch° (pp. 57-58) places this event shortly before the murder of Umar but gives the date as 11 A.H. This seems to be a mistake for 21 A.H. Similarly on p. 37 Ch° refers to some events in Persia in 2 A.H. whereas the right date seems to be 12 A.H. These two dates are either due to misreading of original figures or counted from the death of Muhammad—for it is difficult to believe that a Muhammadan author would give 11 A.H. as the date for an expedition undertaken during the Caliphate of Umar, as the latter succeeded to the Caliphate only in 13 A.H. Similarly Ch° gives wrong dates for the beginning of the Caliphate of Ali (p. 38) and Mu-áwiyah (p. 61).

The statement in Ch° that Chach had ruled for 35 years when this expedition took place, cannot be correct. This is not only in conflict with the statement in

gain any appreciable success in any of these raids which were all undertaken during the Caliphate of Umar (A.D. 634-43).

The defeat at Debal must have taken by surprise the Caliph Umar whose arms were victorious in distant parts of the world. Having failed to approach Sind from the sea-coast on the south, he sent an army to Makrán and Kirmán with a view to attack the western frontier of the kingdom, but like a true statesman, he at the same time asked the governor of Irák to send him detailed information about the country. The governor reported that the king of Sind was very powerful and by no means willing to submit to the Muhammadans. Thereupon all ideas of sending further expeditions against that country were abandoned.¹

The failure of the previous raids induced the next ruler Uthmán to attempt an invasion of Sind by land. He sent his agents to collect information about the country, but their reports were unfavourable. So Uthmán too gave up the enterprise.²

During the next Caliphate, that of 'Ali, a great expedition was sent against India (38-39 A.H.). The Muslim army, which included a

the *Tuhfatu-l-kirám* that Chach ascended the throne in 1 A.H. but is also irreconcilable with the general statements in Ch° on the basis of which the genealogical table of Chach and his successors has been drawn above on p. 26.

It may be noted here that Ch° does not mention the naval raids against Thana or Broach which are mentioned by Baládhuri (p. 209).

¹ The statement that Umar sent an expedition to Makrán and Kirmán is based on the authority of Chach-náma (pp. 58 ff.) But it is clear from the context that the expedition was recalled before it could achieve any success. Al-Baládhuri ignores this expedition altogether. Later authorities refer to the success of Muslim arms in this expedition. According to Ta'ríkh-i-Guzáda, the Muslims conquered on this occasion not only Makrán and Kirmán but also Sijistán, although the ruler of Sind helped the Chief of Makrán (p. 181). Hasan-bin-Muhammad Shiraji, referring to the same incidents, adds that the ruler of Makrán, called Zambil, who was also king of Sind, was killed. Habibu-s Siyar (Price—Vol. I., p. 138) and Tabari also refer to this expedition. These authorities, however, give different names for the leaders of this expedition, and a perusal of Al-Baládhuri, our earliest authority, leaves no doubt that the whole thing was a confused echo of certain incidents which happened at a later period. Al-Baládhuri, for example narrates many incidents described by these authorities, but refer them to a later period. Further, Makrán and Sijistán were conquered by the Muslim forces at a much later date.

Elliot seems to have accepted the later authorities (vol. i., pp. 417-8) which are in conflict with the statement, accepted by him (Ibid, p. 421) that at a later period the governor of Basra sent his agent ' to explore Sijistán and Makrán as well as the countries bordering on the valley of the Indus.'

* Baládhuri, pp. 209-10 ; Ch°, pp. 59-60. The two accounts agree very closely.

large number of nobles and chiefs, advanced, without serious opposition, up to Al-Kíkán or Kíkánán which was a part of Sind. The people of this country (which corresponds to the mountainous regions in Baluchistan round Kelat) made a brave stand and routed the Muslim army. The leader of the Muslim host 'was killed together with all but a few of his followers' (42 A.H. = A.D. 663.). This is the version of Al-Baládhuri. The Chach-náma, on the other hand, relates, that the Muslims obtained a victory at Kíkánán, but turned back on hearing of the murder of 'Ali. This seems to be only a thin pretext for hiding the defeat and disgrace, and the version of Baládhuri seems to be confirmed by later events. Besides, the version in Chach-náma is based on the authority of Amir, son of Hárís, son of Abdul Kais, while, according to Baládhuri, Hárís was himself the leader of the expedition. The son of the defeated leader naturally suppressed the inconvenient details.¹

Henceforth Kíkánán became the chief objective of the Muslim expeditions, and during the Caliphate of Mu'áwiyah (41-60 A.H.), several attempts were made to subdue this outlying frontier post of the kingdom of Sind. The first expedition was led by Al-Muhallab in the year 44 (A.D. 665.) He advanced against Kíkán from the side of Kábul in the north, but did not achieve any conspicuous success.² The second expedition led by 'Abdallab, in spite of initial successes, ended in a disaster, and the routed Mussalman army fled to Makrán.³ Sinán, the leader of the next expedition, 'proceeded to the frontier and conquered Makrán. He established a garrison there and made it his headquarters.'⁴ The Muslim forces were apparently unable to

¹ Baládhuri (p. 210). Ch° (p. 60) gives the date as 80 which is evidently a slip or misreading for 40. For, immediately before, it refers to the year 38 A.H. It is, however, wrong in stating that the Caliphate of 'Ali began towards the end of that year. As a matter of fact 'Ali became Caliph in 35 A.H. 38 A.H. is the date of the expedition (cf. Elliot, vol. i, p. 422).

² This is omitted in Ch°. Curiously enough, here again, Ch° puts 44 A.H., the date of the first Indian expedition under Mu'áwiyah, as the date of the beginning of his Caliphate (*see* f.n. 1 of Chapter III, p. 18).

³ Baládhuri (p. 211) ; Ch° (p. 62) gives more details of the disaster. Both authorities refer to the curious anecdote of a pregnant woman by way of illustrating the hospitality of the leader of the expedition. Baládhuri refers to some initial success of the Islamic army but this is omitted in Ch°. This expedition probably took place in 46 A.H. (Weil-Geschichte, vol. I, p. 291).

⁴ Baládhuri (p. 212). Apparently there is some confusion about this incident. Baládhuri refers to a tradition according to which Makrán was conquered by

proceed any further. Hence Sinán was replaced by Rashid who proceeded from Makrán and led a successful raid against Kíkánán. But later, while raiding the Mid (i.e., Meds), he was defeated and killed.¹ He was succeeded by Sinán who led another expedition against Kíkánán. He proceeded up to the district of Budhia in Kíkánán but the people there rose against him and killed him.² The next expedition was led by Al-Mundhir (Munzir in Chach-náma). He raided al-Búkán and al-Kíkán and conquered Kuşdár, which, although previously conquered by Sinán, had rebelled against the Muslims. But al-Mundhir died at Kuşdár. The command was then taken over by ibn-Harri who subdued Kuşdár and fought a fierce and successful campaign there, acquiring much booty.³ But Kíkán was far from being subdued. For more than twenty years, the Muslim forces had concentrated their efforts upon the conquest of this frontier of Sind, but failed to achieve any lasting results. The only notable success of the Muslims in this direction was the conquest of Makrán.

During the next twenty-five years, the kingdom of Sind obtained respite from the repeated Muslim aggressions on its frontier. But with the appointment of Al-Hajjáj as governor of Irák, things assumed a new turn. After putting down some internal feuds, he appointed

Hakim ibn Jabalah al-Abdi. Ch° (p. 63) refers to Sinán as having 'succeeded Abdulla, but does not refer to his conquest of Makran. It, however, says that Ahnaf, son of Kaish, who was selected for the holy wars in Hind remained at Makrán for two years.

¹ Baládhuri (p. 212). Ch° (p. 64) gives more details of this expedition. It says that Rashid returned after a year from Kíkánán, and, 'travelling via Sistán, he came to the mountains of Mauzar and Bharj. The natives of this mountainous country mustered about 50,000 men strong to stop him on his way. A bloody battle ensued and Rashid fell a martyr'.

² Ch° (p. 65). Baládhuri (p. 212) refers to Sinán's succession in command, but is silent about his expedition to Kíkán and death. Ch° quotes a memorial verse relating to the martyrdom of Sinán. For the position of Budhia, cf. App. A.

³ Baládhuri (pp. 213-14); Ch° (p. 66) says that Munzir died of illness at Barabi, and does not give any details of his success. Nor does it refer to ibn-Harri's campaign. Ibn-Harri seems to have conquered al-Búkán. Baládhuri refers to a memorial verse to that effect and adds: 'The inhabitants of al-Búkán are Muslims . . . al-Barmaki built a city there which he named al-Buká (the white). This was in the Caliphate of al-Mutasim-billah'.

Elmslie thinks that Munzir referred to in Ch° is a different person from Munzir referred to by Baládhuri (vol. i, 425).

Mujjā'ah as governor of Makrān. Mujjā'ah made some raids and conquered portions of Kandābīl (modern Gandava). On his death, a year later, Muhammad ibn-Hārūn was appointed governor of Makrān during the Caliphate of Walīd.¹

About this time² the king of Ceylon³ sent to Al-Hajjāj some women who were born in his country as Muslims, their fathers, who were merchants, having died. He wanted to court favour with Al-Hajjāj by sending them back.⁴ But the ship in which they were sailing was captured by the pirates of Debal.⁵ Al-Hajjāj thereupon wrote to Dāhar, King of Sind, to set the women free, but Dāhar pleaded inability, saying 'I have no control over the pirates who captured them.' Hajjāj regarded this as the *causis belli* against Sind and determined to make renewed effort on a large scale for conquering a country which had so long defied the arms of Islam. The Caliph was at first unwilling to sanction the risky expedition, but ultimately gave his consent at the importunities of Hajjāj. Hajjāj thereupon sent 'Ubaidaliāh to raid Debal but he was defeated and killed.⁶ Then a second expedition was sent by way of sea from Oman, under Budail (called Bazil in Ch°). Budail got reinforcements from Muhammad ibn-Hārūn and marched towards Debal. Dāhar, on hearing the news, sent a force under his son Jaisimha to protect

¹ Balādhuri (p. 215), Ch° (p. 69) gives 85 A.H. as the date for the conquest of Kandail (i.e. Kandābīl of Balādhuri).

² No definite date is given either by Balādhuri (p. 215) or in Ch° (p. 69). The latter, however, states, before relating this incident, that Muhammad Hārūn was appointed governor about 85 A.H. and ruled for five years. This would place the event in or shortly after 91 A.H. (=709 A.D.). This is in full agreement with the general statement in Ch°, on the strength of which the chronological table of the kings has been drawn up above on p. 26. It will be seen that Ch° relates events up to 708 A.D. and then begins his accounts of the Muslim expedition which took place the following year. cf. f.n. 1 on page 37 below.

³ Balādhuri says 'island of Rubies' (p. 215). Ch° says 'Sarandeb' (p. 69).

⁴ Balādhuri (pp. 215-16). Ch° (p. 69) refers to presents, including pearls and jewels, both for Hajjāj and the Caliph. It also refers to a number of Muslim women 'who went to visit the Kaaba and the capital city of the Caliphs'. Balādhuri refers only to one ship but Ch° refers to a small fleet of boats. Both Balādhuri and Ch° refer to the miraculous legend 'that the captive women cried out 'O Hajjāj', and Hajjaj replied 'Here am I'.

⁵ According to Ch° (p. 70) the robbers belonged to the tribe of Nagamroh. Balādhuri says they were 'Medes'.

⁶ Balādhuri (p. 216). Ch° does not refer to this.

proceeded to Debal and made an entrenched camp. The siege materials reached him by way of sea and he made preparations for taking the fort. Catapults were taken out and fixed. There was a great Buddhist temple in the city with a high flag-staff over a dome. A curious story is told in *Chach-nāma* in connection with this flag-staff. A *Brāhmaṇa*, we are told, came to Muhammad and said 'We have learnt from our science of the stars that the country of Sind will be conquered by the army of Islam. . . . But as long as that standard of the temple stands in its place, it is impossible for you to take the fort'. Then Muhammad asked his chief engineer to remove the standard by throwing stones from the Catapult, and the standard was broken in no time. *Balādhuri* relates this incident, but makes no mention of the prophecy of the *Brāhmaṇa*. The destruction of the standard demoralized the besieged and the town was taken by assault. No quarter was given, and for 3 days the inhabitants were ruthlessly slaughtered by the victorious foe.¹

Muhammad then sent the battering-rams, etc. by boats and himself advanced to Nerun. Its Buddhist priests had already entered into a treasonable correspondence with *Hajjāj* and now openly received Muhammad and supplied him with provisions.² Muhammad then advanced to *Siwistān* (*Sehwan*) and conquered many cities without any serious opposition. The only resistance which he met with was from the city of *Siwistān*.³ Here, too, the Buddhist party welcomed the Arabs and entered into a compact with them against their own governor. The Buddhist sections of other towns were actuated to do the same, partly on account of their aversion to slaughter and bloodshed, and partly due to their belief in the prophetic saying of the sacred

¹ The date 73 given in *Ch°* (p. 79) for the conquest of Debal, is evidently a mistake for 93. The *Ch°* quotes several letters passing between *Dāhar* and Muhammad but their genuineness may be doubted. *Balādhuri* says (p. 218) that after the capture of Debal, Muhammad marked out a quarter for the Muslims, built a mosque and settled 4,000 colonists there. For the identification of Debal, see *Geographical Note A*, Appendix.

² Cf. *Ch°*, pp. 72 and 89 ff. A Samani, probably a Buddhist, was the governor of Nerun (which is represented now by modern Haidarabad). He not only surrendered Nerun but actively helped Muhammad in the subsequent campaign. *Balādhuri* calls the place *al-Birun* (p. 219, but cf. *Elliot*, vol. i, p. 121 f.n.) and says that its inhabitants had sent two Buddhist monks to *al-Hajjāj* and had made a treaty with him.

³ This is called *Maoj*, 30 leagues from Nerun (*Ch°*, p. 93) and also 'the fort of Siwistan' (p. 95). *Balādhuri* calls it *Sahban* (p. 219). *Maoj* was apparently a suburb of Siwistan, modern Sehwan.

books about the conquest of India by Islamic force.¹ Muhammad pursued the ruler of Siwistán as far as Sisam, in Budhiah, and then returned to Nerun, and occupied the city.²

Some leading chiefs of the country now tendered homage to Muhammad and he took by assault the fortified town of Ishbhā.³ Then he proceeded to the country of Raor and Jitor and reached the western bank of the Indus. He now entered into alliance with an important chief called Mokah son of Basáyeh who basely deserted Dáhar on receiving the district of Jortah and the whole province of Bet,⁴ and promised to supply Muhammad with boats for crossing the Indus.

Muhammad then encamped on the bank of the Indus. But before he could cross the river news reached him that Chandram Hálah who some time ago had been the ruler of Siwistan, had caused a revolt, taken possession of the fort and driven away the Arab soldiers. Muhammad sent one of his lieutenants who reduced Siwistan and returned with 4,000 warlike Jats from the place.⁵

¹ Ch^o (p. 105). Baládhuri (p. 219) cf. Chap. iv, f.n. 14.

² Ch^o here reproduces some of the incidents which took place at the time of the first conquest of Nerun (cf. p. 91 and 104). It is possible, though not very likely, that the incidents might have been repeated.

³ Ch^o (p. 105) places it in the year 93 A.H.

⁴ It is difficult to follow Ch^o at this point. Muhammad writes to Hajjáj from Nerun (pp. 99-100): 'There is one of the tributary rulers under Dáhar, who is the owner of the fortified town of Bet, to the east of the Mehrán, on the bank of a rivulet in an island of the gulf of Khánbehat and is called Basámi Rásal. All the chief officers and noblemen of Rai Dáhar as well as most of the princes of Hind and Sind are under his influence. This prince has been advising and inducing everyone of these great men and nobles to submit to us. They have now great confidence in us and have sent us humble messages promising to be loyal to us.' Next we are told that when Muhammad proceeded from Ishbhā to Raor he was joined by Jásen, the ruler of Bet. Then suddenly we are introduced to Mokah, son of Basáyeh, a tributary chief and a relation of Dáhar, and Muhammad secured his alliance by cession of Jortah and Bet and granting other honours, and Mokah on his part promised to collect and supply boats to enable Muhammad to cross the Indus, (pp. 104-8).

It is difficult to explain what became of Basámi Rásal and Jásen, both described as rulers of Bet, and why Mokah assumed such an importance in the eyes of Muhammad.

⁵ Ch^o (pp. 116-7), Baládhuri seems to refer to this episode as the conquest of 'Sadusan' (p. 219). Apparently, he uses the two names 'Sahban' and 'Sadusan' to denote the same place 'Siwistan,' also called Sewan, without probably knowing it himself. Baládhuri is silent about the incidents that took place during the period between the conquest of Siwistan and the suppression of revolt in that place.

Dáhar, with his army, also encamped on the opposite bank of the Indus¹ and his son Jaisimha joined him with a large number of men and instruments of war in boats by the small river of Kotak. Muhammad ibn-Kásim was also reinforced by 2,000 select horse sent by Hajjáj. But he halted on the bank of the river for nearly two months, whereupon Hajjáj reprimanded him and urged him to cross the river and fight with Dáhar. Muhammad, in obedience to Hajjáj's command, made preparations to cross the river. He came to the country of Sakrah, in the district of Jhim, posted a strong garrison at the island of Bet and crossed near it without much difficulty by means of a bridge of boats.²

Muhammad, having crossed to the eastern bank of the Indus, made himself master of the fort of Bet and then proceeded towards Raor. He soon arrived at Jitor and occupied the bank of a lake between Jitor and Raor.³ Dáhar despatched his son Jaisimha to oppose Muhammad, but his army was routed and Jaisimha fled to Dáhar, who was encamped to the east of the lake.

¹ The identification of the place where the two armies were encamped on the opposite banks of the Indus, has been discussed in Appendix B.

² Muhammad crossed the river without any loss. According to Al-Baládhuri this was due to the help of a neighbouring king, Rasil, the king of Kassah (probably the same as Mokah) who allowed a bridge to be built near his territory. The Chach-náma, on the other hand, suggests that Dáhar deliberately allowed Muhammad to cross the river when the latter offered him the alternative of either crossing the river unopposed, or allowing Muhammad to do the same. An Arab chieftain in the service of Dáhar gave him good advice viz. to oppose the crossing of the Indus by the enemy and to harass them and intercept their supply of provisions by means of guerilla warfare. Dáhar was convinced of the soundness of this advice, but still gallantly offered the passage of the river to Muhammad, saying, 'lest it be imagined by him that we are in perplexity and have become very weak and powerless' (pp. 108-111). Such mediæval chivalry was completely out of place in fighting with a stubborn and determined enemy. But, all the same, Dáhar, according to Ch° (p. 125), sent the brother of Mokah whom he appointed the governor of Bet, to oppose Muhammad's passage. 'Muhammad, therefore, ordered all the boats to be linked together in a line along the western bank to the length corresponding to the breadth of the river at that place . . . then moving the whole block of boats, keeping one end of it fixed at the crossing-point and turning the other, the head boat was made to touch the opposite point on the eastern bank.' The Arab soldiers now landed from the boats and made vigorous assaults. Dáhar's soldiers fled and were pushed up to the fort of Jhim (Ch° 125).

It may be noted here that according to Táríkh Másúmí, Muhammad crossed at Talla in order to go to Alor.

³ Ch°—pp. 126 ff.

The brother of Moka, whom Dáhar had appointed governor of Bet in place of the latter, now joined Muhammad. By the help and advice of the two renegade brothers, Muhammad crossed the lake that lay between his and Dáhar's army and encamped at Jitor on the stream of Doharah whence he could command both the front and rear of Dáhar's army and cut off its supply. Dáhar then went to the fort of Raor and having left his baggage and retinue, took up a position about a league from the Arab army.

Here a pitched battle took place between the two armies. The Chachnáma has described it in detail.¹ In spite of desertion and

¹ The details of the battle are taken from Ch°, pp. 133 ff. Baládhuri's account is very brief.

The date of the defeat and death of Dáhar at the hands of Muhammad ibn-Kásim is variously given. Chach-náma (p. 137) gives the date as 93 A.H. (= A.D. 712.). Tuhfat-ul-Kirám places the event on the 11th day of Ramzan (16th June A.D. 712) (Ch°, p. 137 f.n.). Baládhuri does not mention any date, but Tabari gives the following chronology. 'In the year 90 Muhammad ibn-Kásim killed the king of Sind. In the year 94 he conquered India and in the year 95 he conquered further India with the exception of Kiráj and Alimandel (f. 188. Translated by Weil in Geschichteder Chalifen. p. 506 f.n. 1.) The interval of 4 years, between the death of Dáhar and the conquest of India by Muhammad ibn-Kásim is difficult to explain, and it may be suspected that 90 is a misreading for 93.

According to both Abul Fida and Abul Faraj, the conquest of India took place in 94, while ibn Kutaiba places it in 93 (Elliot, p. 436). I do not know on what authority A. Müller gives the date as 89 A.H. (Der Islam in Morgen Und Abendland, pp. 412-13).

On the whole it would, I think, be safer to take 93 A.H. (A.D. 712) as the date of the battle.

The piracy at Debal which was regarded as *causus belli* by Hajjáj must have taken place a few years before this. No definite date is given for this event in Chach-náma but there are some details which enable us to arrive at an approximate date. We are told (p. 69) that Muhammad Hárún was sent to Hindustan (apparently the border-land of Makrán) after 86 A.H. when Walíd became Caliph, and spent five years in fighting with Alafis and other enemies. As the incident about piracy is placed after this, it cannot be dated before 91 A.H. On the other hand, this date cannot be pushed any further, for between this date and the year 93, the date of the expedition of Muhammad ibn-Kásim, we have to place the negotiations between Hajjáj and Dáhar and two unsuccessful expeditions sent by Hajjáj, permission for which had to be secured, with difficulty and after some delay, from the unwilling Caliph.

According to Táríkh-Másúmí, Muhammad ibn-i-Kásim started on his Indian expedition in 92 A.H. (Ch°, p. 75 f.n.). This would make the date 91 very doubtful, if not impossible. On the other hand, a statement by Abul Fida would induce us to push back this date very considerably. This passage, quoted by Weil (Geschichte der Chalifen, p. 504 f.n. 1) may be summed up as follows: 'Hajjáj, therefore, requested Abdul Malik to send an army to India but he declined to subject the Muslims to perils of a distant land. When Walíd succeeded, he granted the

treachery, Dáhar fought with valour, and on the second day the Muslim army was nearly routed. 'Thus the infidels made a rush on the Arabs from all sides, and fought so steadily and bravely that the army of Islam became irresolute, and their lines were broken up in great confusion. It was generally believed that the Arabs were defeated and put to flight and men were struck dumb and overawed.'¹

Muhammad rallied his men by evoking the name of the great and glorious God, and the renegade chiefs of Sind came to his aid. The battle was renewed. 'Dáhar drove his elephant upon the army of Islam. Muhammad ibn-Kásim then ordered his naphtha-fingers to shoot their naphtha, and one of these men threw a naphtha arrow at the litter of Dáhar on the elephant and the litter immediately caught fire.' The elephant thereupon madly plunged into water. Although Dáhar got back on shore, he became the target of Muslim archers, and an arrow struck him at his heart. He slowly dismounted from the elephant when an Arab swordsman cut off his head.

As usual, the death of the king was followed by a complete rout of the army, and the survivors took refuge in the fort of Raor. Jaisimha, the son of Dáhar, now retreated to the strong fort of Bahmanábád while the widowed queen was left to defend Raor. The queen put up a brave resistance, and when conditions became hopeless, burnt herself along with other ladies to escape the infamy of falling into the hands of the Muslims. Raor fell into the hands of Muhammad ibn-Kásim.

Muhammad now marched towards Bahmanábád. On the way he had to spend nearly four months for capturing two fortified towns called Bahrór and Dahlelah. Jaisimha also made elaborate preparations, but he suffered a serious loss by the desertion of the old Wazir to Muhammad. Jaisimha strongly fortified Alor, the capital, and Bahmanábád, and himself moved with an army to harass the enemy and cut off its supplies. Muhammad ibn-Kásim besieged Bahmanábád. 'Every day the besieged came out and offered battle and fierce fight continued from morning till evening.' In this way they fought for six months. When Muhammad ibn-Kásim despaired of taking the fort his mind became full of anxiety. But here again treachery played its

request of Hajjáj.' According to this, the piracy must have taken place sometime before 86 A.H. the date of the death of Abdul Malik. This would place the piracy 6 or 7 years before the expedition of Muhammad ibn-Kásim—a very reasonable period to account for all that happened during the interval.

¹ Ch°, p. 142.

part and some leading citizens entered into a secret covenant with Muhammad and betrayed the fort.¹ Muhammad subdued several other places and then proceeded to the capital city Alor, which was in charge of Fofi, son of Dáhar. After some fighting, the residents of the city wanted to make peace with Muhammad, whereupon Fofi withdrew from the city and joined his brothers Jaisimha and Wakiah at a place called Nazwalah Sandal in Jitor. Alor submitted to the conqueror.²

After conquering the strongholds of Bábiah, Gholkonda and Sakkah, Muhammad proceeded to Multan. Here a brave resistance was offered by Kundrai and Bachehra. Fighting continued for two months and Muhammad was unable to make a breach in the walls. Here, again, treachery played its part. A traitor pointed out to Muhammad the source of water-supply for the town. Muhammad cut it off and the besieged were obliged to surrender.³

The conquest of Multan was the last great achievement of Muhammad, although he followed it up by other minor conquests. He conquered al-Kiraj, subdued al-Bailamán and made peace with the people of Surast. The death of Hajjáj in 714 A.D. and that of Caliph Walíd, the year following, brought in evil days for him. The next Caliph Sulaimán was a great enemy of Hajjáj and wreaked his vengeance on the members of his family. Muhammad ibn-Kásim was recalled to Irák where, with certain other adherents of Hajjáj, he was put to torture and died.⁴

¹ Ch°, pp. 156-171. Baládhuri, p. 221.

The date of the capture of Bahmanábád is given as 93 in the Text of Ch°—but is evidently a mistake for 94 (p. 159 f.n.).

² Ch°, pp. 175-181. Baládhuri (p. 221) names Baghrur, Sawandrai and Basmad as having been conquered by Muhammad between Bahmanábád and Alor. Ch° names Musthal, Bharowar, the lands of the Sammahs, Luhanahs and Sahtahs. Alor fell in 94 A.H. This is implied in Ch° and expressly stated in Tuhfatul Kirám (Ch°, p. 177 f.n.)

³ Baládhuri (p. 222) only refers to the conquest of Sikkah and Multan. Ch° (pp. 187-192) gives fuller details. Cunningham has argued against the probability that Multan could have been forced to surrender from want of water (Anc. Geo., p. 275).

⁴ Muir—*The Caliphate* (New Edition), p. 354. According to Baládhuri Muhammad returned from Multan to Alor on hearing of Hajjáj's death, and then conquered Al-Kiraj. He also sent force against Al-Bailamán, which submitted, and made peace with the Mids of Surast. (For identification, cf. App. B).

As soon as Sulaimán became Caliph, he sent Yazid to Sind. Yazid put Muhammad in chains and tortured him to death. According to Ch°, Muhammad did not return from his expedition to the north.

According to Chach-nāma Muhammad had proceeded from Multan to the frontiers of Kashmir, and at the same time sent an expedition against Kanauj. But before any material success was obtained, the fatal order of the Caliph condemning Muhammad to a barbarous death stopped all further proceedings.¹

The Indian kings did not fail to take advantage of this internal commotion among the Muslims, and re-occupied their kingdoms. Dāhar's son Jaisimha re-occupied Bahmanābād. The Caliph sent Habib to subdue Sind. He conquered Alor and made some minor conquests.²

The next Caliph Umar II (A.D. 717-720), himself a man of austere religious devotion, wrote to the kings of Sind, inviting them to become Muslims and be subject to him, agreeing to let them continue on their thrones and have the same privileges and obligations as the Muslims. Many kings, including Jaisimha, son of Dāhar, accepted Islam and adopted Arab names. Thus the province of Sind became independent again, and Kandābīl or Gandava is referred to as 'on the remotest frontiers of the Arab Empire'.³

During the Caliphate of Hishām (A.D. 724-743) Junaid was appointed the governor of Sind. A quarrel soon broke out between him and Jaisimha, the son of Dāhar. Jaisimha apostatized and declared war against Junaid, but was defeated in a naval engagement in the lake of Sarki and taken prisoner.⁴

Junaid then conquered al-Kīraj and sent expeditions to the interior of the country. He sent lieutenants against Marmad or Mirmad, al-Mandal, Dahnaj and Barwas. He also sent an army to Uzain and

¹ Ch^o relates the story how two virgin daughters of Dāhar, who were sent as prisoners to Caliph Walīd, brought about the death of Muhammad ibn-Kāsim by falsely accusing him of having outraged them before sending them to the Caliph. The story seems to be palpably absurd. The Caliph who ordered the death of Muhammad was not Walīd but his successor Sulaimān, and his barbarous treatment of Muhammad and other partisans of Hajjāj can be easily explained by the strained relation between the two.

² As the accounts in Ch^o do not proceed beyond the death of Muhammad ibn-Kāsim, our sole authority for the account that follows, unless otherwise stated, is Balādhuri (pp. 225 ff.). The name of Dāhar's son is written as Hullishah, but cf. Balādhuri, vol. ii. p. 225 f.n. 1 and Elliot, vol. i. p. 124 f.n. 2.

³ Elliot, vol. i. p. 440.

⁴ The original expression is *Baḥīḥatū'sh-Sharqīy*. Haig takes it to mean 'the eastern inland sea' that is, the sea that once permanently covered and that still periodically covers the Ran of Kachchh ('Indus Delta country,' p. 65).

the land of Al-Malibah. They waged a war with Uzain, raided Bahrimad and set fire to its suburbs. Al-Junaid himself conquered al-Bailamān and al-Jurz.¹

Among the places named, Marmad may be safely identified with Maru-Māra corresponding to Jaisalmer and part of Jodhpur. Barwas is undoubtedly Broach, and Al-Mandal probably denotes Mandor. Jurz was the Arabic corruption of Gurjara and Al-Bailamān probably refers to the circle of states referred to in Ghaṭiyālā inscription of Kakkuka as Vallamaṇḍala. Uzain and Maliba no doubt refer to Ujjain and Mālava, i.e., the eastern and western Malwa.

The Nausari plates of the Gujarat Chālukya Pulakeśirāja, dated A. D. 738, refer to Arab expeditions in course of which they defeated the kings of the Saindhavas, the Kachchhellas, Saurāshṭra, the Chāvoṭakas, the Mauryas and the Gurjaras. There can be hardly any doubt that these expeditions refer to those undertaken by Junaid or his lieutenants. We learn from Nausari plates that Pulakeśirāja defeated the Arabs, while the Gwalior inscription of Bhoja tells us that the Pratihāra king Nāgabhaṭa defeated the powerful forces of a *Mlecchha* king. As the dates of both these events fall within a decade of A. D. 724 it confirms and explains the statement of Al-Balādhuri that 'in the days of Tamīm (the successor of Junaid) the Muslims withdrew from the land of Al-Hind, and abandoned their headquarters and they have not returned so far as that since'.² Unfortunately the fragmentary nature of Indian evidence does not supply us detailed information of the course of events which compelled the Muslim forces, after the first flush of their success, to take shelter behind the Indus. Whether the result was due to the combined efforts of Indian chiefs including the Pratihāra king Nāgabhaṭa, and the Chālukya king Pulakeśirāja, or to isolated victories obtained by them, we do not know; but there is no doubt that henceforth the Muslim suzerainty stopped short at the right bank of the Indus. This is confirmed by the following statement of Al-Balādhuri.

¹ These conquests of Junaid have been partly discussed in my monograph on the Gurjara-Pratihāras (*Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University*, vol. x. pp. 20 ff.) The two paragraphs that follow are merely summaries of that discussion. For further discussion on the identity of the kingdoms named cf. App. B.

² Balādhuri, (p. 228).

'Afterwards, while al-Hakam ibn-'Awánah al-Kalbi was ruler, the people of Al-Hind apostatized with the exception of the inhabitants of Kassah. A place of refuge to which the Muslims might flee was not to be found, so he built on the further side of the lake (al-Buhairah), where it borders on Al-Hind, a city which he named al-Mahfûṭḥah, establishing it as a place of refuge for them where they would be secure, and making it a capital. ¹

Later on, continues al-Baládhuri, al-Hakam 'built on this side of the lake a city which he called al-Manṣúrah. It is where the governors reside to-day'. ²

Al-Hakam fought and scored some successes, but was killed. Afterwards, the governors 'kept fighting the enemy and seizing whatever came into their hands, and subduing places in the neighbourhood whose inhabitants rebelled'. ³

Thus the period of confusion in the Islamic state during the last years of the Umayyids also witnessed the decline of Islamic power in India.

With the establishment of the Abbássids, a fresh effort was made to extend the power of Islam. Al-Manṣúr (A. D. 754-775) appointed Hishám ibn-'Amr-at-Taghlibi, governor of Sind. 'He conquered Kashmir, obtaining many prisoners and slaves. He conquered al-Multan and cleared out a faction of Arabs which was in Kandábíl. He went to al-Kunduhár with the fleet, and conquered it, throwing down the Budd (i.e. a temple) and building a mosque in its place. ⁴

It is difficult to imagine that Kashmir, then at the height of its power, was conquered in any sense of the term. At the utmost it can only mean some successful frontier raids. On the other hand it has been inferred by Levi and Chavannes from some statements in the *Rājataranginī* that Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa (C. A. D. 733-769) thrice defeated

¹ Baládhuri, (pp. 228-229).

² *Ibid*, p. 229.

³ *Ibid*, p. 229.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 231. Al-Kunduhár is Kandahar (Le Strange, p. 347). For other identifications cf. Elliot vol. i, p. 445. But it is difficult to understand how Kandahar could be approached by a fleet. The Abbassid governors had to fight with Arab factions, evidently partisans of the Umayyids, both in Kandábíl and on the bank of the Indus, for Baládhuri tells us (p. 230) that Músa routed the army of Manṣúr ibn-Jamhúr al-Kalbi, somewhere near the Indus, and the latter fled towards the desert and perished of thirst. As to Kandahar, the place was evidently taken from the Indians, first, because no Arab faction is referred to, and secondly, because the destruction of a Hindu temple and building of a new mosque in its place, are signs of a new conquest.

a ruling chief of the Arabs. The fact that we do not hear of any further Arab invasion of Kashmir seems to confirm the view that Lalitāditya effectively checked the aggression of the Arabs in that quarter.¹

The reconquest of Multan shows that the Arabs had lost the whole of northern Sind during the period of confusion.

In the next Caliphate, that of al-Mahdī, a naval expedition was sent against India under Ar-Rabī ibn-Ṣubh al-Fakīh, but it was a failure. Ar-Rabī died and was buried in one of the islands in the year 160.² During the Caliphate of Hārūn-al-Rashid, his governor of Sind is said to have conquered a few places in western Sind.

The Abbassids do not seem to have gained much success in their Indian expeditions, nor were they able to consolidate the Muslim conquests in Sind. Imrān ibn-Mūsa, the governor under Caliph Mutasim-billāh (A. D. 833-842), 'made an expedition against the Kikānites, who are Zutt, fighting and defeating them, and building a city which he called al-Baiḍā', where he established his army'. This shows that the hardy Jāṭhs of Kikānān, who defied the Muslim arms as early as the year 42 A. H. (A. D. 662), were far from being subdued yet. Further, we hear of frequent conflicts with Jāṭhs and Meds in the neighbourhood of Alor, the capital of Sind. Sometimes the Muslim army met with serious disaster. Thus they captured a place called Sindan during the Caliphate of al-Ma'mun, and sent later on, from this base, a naval expedition with 70 ships of war. The fleet conquered Fāliand returned to Sindan. The Hindus of Sindan, however, rose against its ruler and killed and crucified him. They became masters of the city but 'left its mosque for the Muslims to assemble in and pray for the Caliph'.³

With the decline of the Abbassid power, the Muslim governor of Sind became virtually independent. In 257 A. H. (A. D. 871) the

¹ *Rājataranginī*—Ch. IV. v 167. Levi and Chavannes infer from this verse that Lalitāditya thrice defeated the Arab chief, the word *Mumuni* in this verse being taken by them as equivalent to 'Amir-al-Mumenim' the title of the Caliph (*Journal Asiatique* 1895, Part II p. 350 f.n. 1). Stein, however, does not accept this view (*cf.* his remarks on his English translation of this verse).

² Balādhuri, p. 96.

³ Balādhuri, pp. 231-233

The identity of Sindan is doubtful. According to Rashid Uddin it was between Broach and Supara, and nearer to the latter (Elliot Vol. I, p. 66; *cf.* also *Ibid.*, p. 402).

Caliph practically handed over the province to the famous Suffarid leader Ya'kub ibn-Lais. Upon the latter's death, the Muslim territories in Sind were divided between two independent chiefs, those of Maṣūra (near Bahmanābād) and Multan. None of these ever attained to great power, and both had to live in constant dread of their Indian neighbours.

CHAPTER VI

RETROSPECT

If we pass in review the main incidents narrated above in connection with the early Muslim raids on the western border-lands of India, we can have a better perspective view of the history of three centuries of Arab efforts for the conquest of India. The first thing that strikes us is the persistent effort of the Arabs to conquer India, and their wonderful organization, backed by superior knowledge and statesmanship. Since the days of the Second Caliph Umar, the conquest of Hīnd and Sind loomed large in the eyes of successive Caliphs and their eastern governors, and they set about their task with a method and determination so rarely to be met with among other nations of that age.

It is well-known that only four routes are open to a hostile army operating against India from the west. One way is by the sea, and the other three lie, roughly speaking, through Khyber Pass, Bolan Pass and the Makrān coast. It cannot be regarded as a mere coincidence that, from the very beginning, we find the Arabs endeavouring to penetrate into India through every one of these routes. The early naval raids against Thana, Broach and Debal, and subsequent raids in the same direction, mark their vain efforts to reach India by sea. Of the land-routes, the Khyber Pass was guarded by Kabul and Zabul while the Bolan Pass was guarded by the brave Jāṭhs of al-Kikān or Kikānān. The long-drawn struggles of the Arabs with these powers, which we have narrated above, mark their steady but fruitless endeavours to enter India through the two great passes. The hardy mountaineers of these regions, backed by the natural strength of their hilly country, offered a stubborn resistance to the conquerors of the world, and though often defeated, ever refused to yield. Unfortunately we have no independent evidence of the brave and heroic fights they

put up for more than two hundred years, and our knowledge is entirely derived from the picture as painted by the hands of the victors. But even from the records of Muhammadan writers we can have some idea of the wonderful skill and energy which they displayed against enormous odds, and the crushing and humiliating defeats which they not unoften inflicted upon the army of Islam. If India had her history, the heroic deeds of these brave peoples, who defended her gates against Islam for two centuries, would probably have ere long received the recognition they so eminently deserve.

When all the three routes failed, the Muhammádans attempted the fourth one through Makrán coast. Makrán was then dependent on the ruler of Sind, and he must have undoubtedly opposed a resistance to the Muslims in that region. The Muhammadan historians have dimly preserved the reminiscence of this, though details are lacking.¹ Here, again, the early efforts of the Arabs did not prove very successful, but ultimately Muhammad ibn-Kásim forced his way through it to the heart of Sind.

We may pause for a moment to consider why the Arabs succeeded in this route, while they failed in the other three. In the absence of fuller knowledge of details, it is not possible to give a complete and satisfactory answer to this question, but several points seem to suggest themselves on a perusal of the scanty material that we possess.

In the first place, the equipment of the army of Muhammad ibn-Kásim was made on a lavish scale and forces were requisitioned even from distant Syria.² Hajjáj, the energetic governor, had staked his reputation upon this one expedition³ and personally looked to the smallest details. His master-mind directed the whole operation from a distance; and he found in Muhammad ibn-Kásim a faithful, honest, able and obedient lieutenant. The value of this factor can be easily judged when we contrast this expedition with that sent against Zabulistan under 'Abd-ar-Rahmán about 13 years before. That expedition too, was splendidly equipped, but the personal differences between Hajjáj and Abd-ar-Rahmán led to a veritable disaster.

¹ Cf. Ch. V, f.n. 2.

² For details of Kásim's army cf. Elliot, Vol. I, (p. 434 ff.)

³ Cf. Ch. V, f.n. 18,

But while the army of Islam had had all the advantages, the kingdom of Sind was labouring at this moment under some peculiar disadvantages which have been stated above.¹ While these had undermined the strength of the kingdom, the personality of the king and the treachery and superstitions of the people were no less important factors in bringing about the downfall of the state. King Dāhar was not lacking in courage or bravery, but his statesmanship and military skill were of a very inferior type. Muhammad ibn-Kásim had chosen the Makrán route and was obliged to send his heavy luggage, particularly the siege materials, by way of sea. It is impossible to explain why Dāhar did not make any efforts to engage the Muslim fleet before it reached Debal. The Muhammadans were not a strong sea-power, and the very fact that they dared send their heavy war-equipment by way of sea shows that they did not regard the naval strength of Dāhar as of much importance. Yet precisely it was here that Dāhar showed a lamentable lack of insight. He could not possibly be unaware of the constant and determined endeavours of the Muslim forces to invade his kingdom. He knew that the enemy could choose either the route through Bolan Pass or the Makrán coast and although an invasion by sea alone was not likely, the sea-power was an important factor for an army marching through Makrán. For, that army would have to depend upon a fleet for carrying its heavy siege materials, and even apart from that consideration, an enemy fleet cruising along the coast would make the position of the invading army sufficiently precarious. Thus the command over sea was essential for the success of an invading army marching through Makrán.

All these facts should have been obvious to the king of Sind, but although he evidently put forth great efforts to guard the Bolan Pass through Kíkán², he did not seem to have taken any precaution to guard against the invasion by Makrán. He seems to have hardly any navy. He confessed to Hajjáj that he could not control the pirates near the coast of Debal, and we do not hear of any opposition being given to the Muhammadan navy, either in the course of its journey by sea to Debal

¹ See Ch. IV, pp. 23 ff.

² As Kíkán was, at least nominally, included in the kingdom of Sind, it may be presumed that the king of Sind was aiding the people of Kíkán in their brave defence.

or in the course of its sailing up the Indus to Nerun. The absence of a navy in a state which possesses an extensive sea-coast exposed to enemy raids is almost incredible. It can only be accounted for by the fact that for nearly 30 years, from 670 to 700 A.D., Dáhar was not in possession of the southern part of Sind and it came into his possession only about 10 years before the expedition of Muhammad ibn-Kásim. While Dáhar was busy fighting with the Muslims near his frontiers at Kíkánán, the rival king Daharsiah was probably making a friendly gesture to the Arabs against their common enemy. In any case the subsequent events show that the southern parts of Sind were favourably inclined to the Arabs. Both Nerun and Siwistan, the two main strongholds of Sind in the south, opened their gates to Muhammad ibn-Kásim without any resistance, and the details given in Chach-náma certainly indicate that an alliance already existed between the leading people of Nerun and the Muslim power.¹ In addition to rivalry between the kings Dáhar and Daharsiah, religious differences also helped to further the split between the north and the south. The latter was the stronghold of the Buddhists and, for reasons stated above, the Buddhists fraternized with the Muhammadans, instead of rallying to their king and defending their country.²

This unpatriotic character of the Buddhists is, no doubt, partly due to their aversion to war and bloodshed insisted upon by their religious creed, but it is also partly due to the international character which was associated with the religion from an early date. The spread of Buddhism outside the frontiers of India, gave it a catholic character and the ideal of universal religious fraternity transcended that of a nation or country. That is at least the most favourable interpretation we can give of their desertion and treachery.

But even if the absence of the navy may be explained, it is difficult to account for the way in which Dáhar allowed the Muslim army to cross unopposed the mighty river Sind. Chach-náma has preserved a story which ascribes it to the mediæval gallantry on the part of

¹ Chach-náma states (p. 72) that the Buddhist governor of Nerun sent his confidential agents to Hajjáj and entered into an agreement with him, even before Muhammad ibn-Kásim set out on his expedition.

² Cf. Ch. IV. f.n. 14; cf. also the speech attributed to the Buddhist priests of Siwistan in Ch^o, p. 93.

Dáhar but we can only describe it as an incredible folly.¹ According to Chach-náma, an Arab chieftain advised Dáhar to oppose the crossing of the river and to harass the enemy and intercept their supply of provisions by means of guerilla warfare.² Whether this be true or not, the course suggested was one which should have commended itself to any one possessing an ordinary degree of military skill. The position of Muhammad ibn-Kásim was a difficult one. With the mighty river in front and the hostile hilly country behind, he could have easily been harassed, in the way suggested, for any length of time. But Dáhar failed to take advantage of his strategic position. Compare this with the skill with which the kings of Kabul and Zabul fully utilized the natural advantages of their hilly country by luring the enemy into inextricable situations amid the hills, and we shall find adequate reason for the failure of one and the success of the other against the Muslims.

To the inexplicable want of strategy on the part of Dáhar, and the treachery of the Buddhists of the south, we must add the base betrayal of the chief officials and grandees of Sind to account for its ruler's ignominious end. All important chiefs and officials seem to have deserted his cause. This is partly accounted for by the superstitious idea prevailing among the people that according to the Hindu Śāstras (sacred books) the country was destined to fall into the hands of the Muhammadans, and it was therefore useless to fight.³ But the attitude of the chiefs was perhaps also due to personal feelings against the son of the usurper who had driven out the old royal family.

All these causes, and perhaps others which we do not know, account for the fall of Sind. The conquest of Sind should not,

¹ Cf. Ch. V. f.n. 31.

² *Ibid.*

³ When Muhammad was besieging Debal, 'a Brahmin came forth from the garrison, and cried for mercy. He said 'We have learnt from our science of the stars that the country of Sind will be conquered by the army of Islam and the infidels will be put to flight' (Ch°, p. 81). Again, the chief of Budhiah told Muhammad ibn-Kásim; 'our astrologers and interpreters of dreams have found out by means of the astronomical science, and have openly given out, that this whole country will fall into the hands of the army of Islam' (Ch°, p. 97). Mokah, son of Basáyeh, deserted his master and joined Muhammad ibn-Kásim because 'the sages and philosophers of Hind, who are the original residents of this country, have found from their books of antiquity, by the use of their astrolabe and their astrology, that this empire will be conquered by an army of Islam' . . . (Ch°, p. 107).

therefore, be regarded as indicating in a general way the superiority of the Muslims over the Indians, from a military point of view. This is further borne out by the fact that the conquest of Sind was the first and the last great achievement of the Arabs in India. Junaïd, no doubt, was triumphant for a time over the petty states in the neighbourhood of Sind, but as soon as he came into conflict with the powerful states like those of the Pratihāras and the Chālukyas, the spell of his success was broken. Even the greater part of Sind was lost in a short time. Ultimately, after three centuries of unremittent efforts, we find the Arab dominion confined to the two petty states of Mansura and Multan.

The Arab penetration into India and Europe presents some striking parallels. The Arabs got a footing in a corner of Europe through the conquest of Spain, almost about the same time that they obtained a similar hold on India by the conquest of Sind, treachery playing no small part in either case. In both cases they started from the base, thus secured, to make further conquests and enter into the very hearts of Europe and India. For a time they seemed to carry everything. But Charles Martel saved Europe by the famous victory at Poitiers, and about the same time the Arabs received a similar check in India, in the hands of Nāgabhaṭa and Pulakeśi. But neither history nor tradition has preserved the name and fame of these Charles Martels of India. Only the study of archaeology in recent times has rescued from oblivion the names of the two heroes to whom belongs the credit of saving India from the hands of the Arabs. The check in both cases proved effective. The Arabs occupied Spain, but had to give up the ambition of conquering Europe. In India the Arabs continued to occupy the valley of the Indus, but their attempts to penetrate further inland proved abortive. Even on the Indus their position was a precarious one and the hardy trans-Indus tribes like the Jāṭhs of Kikānān were far from being thoroughly subdued.

The decline of the Arab supremacy in India, after the short but brilliant successes of Muhammad ibn-Kāsim and Junaïd must be attributed to two main causes, viz., the internal condition of the Muslim empire in the last days of the Umayyids, and the alertness and strength of Indian States. The conquest of Sind made the Indians realize the gravity of their danger, and fortunately there were powerful kings who had enough military strength to inflict crushing defeats upon t

foreigners. Reference has been made to the Pratihāra king Nāgabhaṭa, Chālukya king Pulakeśirāja and the king of Kāśmir, Lalitāditya, who all defeated the Muslims. The extent to which the Indians realized the nature of this danger appears from the fact that sometime between A.D. 713 and 741 a king of Central India, (most probably king Yaśovarman of Kanauj, which, as we have seen above, was threatened by Muhammad ibn-Kāsim), sent an ambassador to the Chinese emperor with a view to make a common cause against the growing menace of Islamic power.¹

The Arabs scored their early successes against one great border kingdom when the mainland had hardly realized the importance of the rise of the new power. But in the second quarter of the eighth century A. D. the latter became alive to the danger and proved fully equal to meet them. Even the establishment of the strong Abbassid power could not materially alter the situation. For about the same time arose two great powers, the Pālas and the Pratihāras which were able to defend their country against the aggressive Islamic power. King Dharmapāla is said in Khālimpur plates to have compelled the Yavana king to acknowledge his suzerainty,² and the term *Yavana* can, at this period, refer only to some Muslim power. The Pratihāra king Nāgabhaṭa II, who flourished early in the ninth century A.D. and was a contemporary of the great Caliphs, Hārūn Ar-Rashid and Al-Māmūn, is described in the Gwalior inscription as having defeated the kings of Sind and captured the strongholds of the Turushkas.³ Here, again,

¹ Muhammad ibn-Kāsim sent a message to Rai Harchandar Jahshal, king of Kanauj, asking him to submit (Ch^o, p. 192).

Jahsal may be Arabic corruption of Yaso (varman) who, we know, was ruling in Kanauj at the time. For the embassy to China cf. Sylvain Levi—*Le Nepal*—Vol. II, pp. 174-175.

² *Ep. Indica*, Vol. IV, pp. 243 ff. Dharmapāla, according to verse 12 held at Kanauj an assembly of his vassal chiefs, viz. kings of Bhoja, Matsya Madra Kuru, Yadu, *Yavana*, Avanti, Gandhara and Kira. As he conquered the states in western and Central Punjab (Gandhara and Madra) and also Malwa and probably Kathiawar Peninsula (Avanti, Yadu) he might have approached the *Yavana* (Muslim) territory either from the north or from the west.

³ *Ep. Indica*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 99 ff. In verse 8 we are told that the king of Sindhu submitted to Nāgabhaṭa. Again in verse 11 Nāgabhaṭa is said to have forcibly seized the hill-forts of the Turushka king. The reference in both cases, and at least in the latter, seems to be to the Muslim ruler of Sind. The reference to Turushka may be explained by the fact that sometime the governors of Sind came from Tukharistan (cf. Balādhuri, p. 230).

the reference is undoubtedly to the Muslim power in Sind. This evidence from Indian side is fully corroborated by the significant fact that Muslim chroniclers do not record any successful Indian campaign since the days of Junaid.¹

We have got a picture of the Muslim power in India about the middle of the tenth century A.D. from the pen of Al-Mas'ūdī.² At that time the Islamic power was confined to the two principalities of Multan and Mansūra. The latter extended, roughly speaking, from the sea to Alor where the former commenced. None of these seems to have been a very powerful state. As regards Multan we are told that one army of the Pratihāra emperor of Kanauj was engaged in fighting with its Muslim ruler. The latter, however, found his security, not so much in his own military strength as in the religious superstitions of the Hindus, for Multan possessed the famous idol which was venerated all over India. 'When the unbelievers' says Al-Mas'ūdī, 'march against Multan, and the faithful do not feel themselves strong enough to oppose them, they threaten to break their idol, and their enemies immediately withdraw'. Similar statement is made by Istākhrī who adds that otherwise the Indians would have destroyed Multan.³

The position of the kingdom of Mansūra, according to Mas'ūdī, was equally unsafe. 'It was constantly at war with a nation called the Meds, who are a race of Sind, and also with other races on the frontiers of Sind.'⁴

Besides the two principalities of Mansūra and Multan in the Indus valley there were other Muslim principalities in the west beyond the Indus, such as Turan and Kushdar, corresponding to old Kikánán, Makrán, and Mushki on the border of Kirmán. Thus even after efforts of 300 years the Arabs were unable to get much beyond the western trans-Indus frontiers of India. When we remember their wonderful

¹ The Dholpur Inscription (Z.D.M.G., Vol. xl, pp. 39 ff.), dated 898 V. S. (= A.D. 842) states that powerful Mlechchha rulers on the river Chambal made obeisance to (*Pranātā Sevān Kurvanti*) the Chāhamāna king 'Chañḍa Mahāsena. If the 'Mlechchha' denote the Muslim, we have another interesting evidence of the breakdown of the Muslim power in the first half of the ninth century A.D. in consequence of the rise of powerful Hindu ruling dynasties.

² Elliot, Vol. I, pp. 23-24.

³ *Ibid*, p. 28.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 24.

military success in other parts of Asia and Africa, the comparatively insignificant results they achieved in India certainly stand out as a marked contrast. The cause of this, however, does not lie in the religious and social peculiarities of India as old historians like Elphinstone vainly attempted to establish. The cause lies undoubtedly in the superior military strength and state-organization of the Indians as compared with most other nations of the time. However incredible this might appear in the light of subsequent events, this is the plain verdict of history.

(pp. 277 ff.). But Raverty has shown good grounds for rejecting this (*J. A. S. B.*, 1892, pp. 251-2, f.n.).

Among the other places Sawārah may be identified with Seorai, the strong fort, which was captured by Husen Shah Arghun on his way from Bhakar to Multan. Cunningham identifies it with the village of Sirwahi, 96 miles below Uchch and 85 miles above Alor (*Anc. Geo.*, p. 292).

Jajhór and Dhanód cannot be identified at present.

II. The Multan division which comes next was a fairly extensive one. Chach first captured the fort of Sikkah, opposite Multan, towards the east, and then Multan itself fell into his hands. Sikkah, according to Cunningham, 'must have been somewhat near the present Māri Sital which is on the bank of the old bed of the Ravi, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles to the east of Multan' (*Anc. Geog.*, pp. 273-4). Chach then proceeded forward. 'The governors of Brahmapur, Karur and Ashahar paid their homage to him and from these places he came to the borders of Kih (Kumba) and Kashmir'. He gradually reached the fort of Shakalhar higher up the town of Kih, which is said to be the boundary of Kashmir.

Of these places, Karur is a well-known city situated on the southern bank of the old Bias river, 50 miles to the south-east of Multan, and 20 miles to the north-east of Bahawalpur (*Cun. Anc. Geog.*, p. 277).

The town of Shakalahar I would identify with the famous ancient town of Sākala, represented by modern Sialkot. Ch^o says that it was the boundary of Kashmir. According to Hiuen Tsang, Sākala was the capital of Cheh-Ka, which lay immediately to the south of the dominions of Kashmir. It is further to be noted that Hiuen Tsang does not refer to any kings of Cheh-Ka and the neighbouring states in the eastern Punjab though he has referred to the political status of the countries which he describes immediately before and after them. Hiuen Tsang visited these countries during the reign of Chach and the statement of Ch^o therefore finds an indirect support in his account.

The town of Ashahar may be identified with Asarur in the Gujran-wala district, the extensive ruins of which are described by Cunningham (*Anc. Geo.*, p. 219).

Brahmapura may be identified with Brahmapura (modern Brahmaur), the ancient capital of Chamba. It is situated on the river Budhil, the southern affluent of the Ravi (*Ann. Report Arch. Survey* 1902-3, pp. 266, 269). It may be noted in passing that as Brahmapura ceased to be the capital when Ch^o was written, a reference to it is an evidence of the genuineness of the account.

It would thus appear that the Multan division included nearly the whole of Eastern and Southern Punjab, and the dominions of Chach in this direction touched the frontiers of Kashmir. It is said in Ch^o that Chach planted trees on the boundary of Kashmir upon the banks of a stream called the Panj Mahiyat (or Panj Nahiyat) which is close to the hills of Kashmir (pp. 30, 192).

III. The third division had its headquarters at Siwistan. Its principal places were Ludhia (or Budhiah or Budhpur) and Chingán (or Jankan) and it included the hills of Rojhán up to the boundary of Makrán (p. 11). [Haig writes Jangal in place of Chingán and identifies it with Jhangar, 13 miles west of Sewan (*Indus Delta country*, p. 57 f.n. 79)].

This division corresponded roughly to modern Baluchistan. When Chach proceeded to restore his authority over it he crossed the Indus and advanced towards Budhiah. Its ruler is said to have had his capital at Kākárāj which is called by the natives Siwis (Ch^o, pp. 30 ff.). For a proper understanding of the geography of this region, we may quote the following from Le Strange:—

'On the north-eastern frontiers of Makrán and close to the Indian border, the Arab geographers describe two districts; namely Túrán, of which the capital was

Kugdār and Budaba to the north of this, of which the capital was Kandābīl (p. 331).

'To the north of these districts was Bālis or Wālihtān with the towns of Sibi and Mastanj (p. 332). The capital city according to Iskhāri was Sibi, spelt Sivi or Siwah (p. 317).'

'Kandābīl has been identified with present Gandava lying south of Sibi and east of Kelat (p. 332) '.

Budhiah of Ch° is no doubt the same as Budaba, and this principality seems to have included the district of Bālis or Wālihtān. The capital Kākārāja or Siwis is no doubt the same as modern Sibi, north of Kandābīl (Gandava).

From Sibi Chach marched to Siwistan, the headquarter of the division. Siwistan can be easily identified with Sehwan, situated on a lofty isolated rock, near a large lake in the vicinity of the Lakhī Hills (Cun. *Ind. Geo.*, p. 304)

As has been said above, this division reached up to Makrān and Chach proceeded in course of his campaign to its furthest limit.

First he proceeded towards Armanbel. This is the same as Armabīl. To quote again from Le Strange :—

'Armabīl and Kanbālī were two important towns, on or near the coast, about half-way between Tiz (a sea-port, and capital of Makrān) and Daybul (Daibal) at the Indus mouth. Iskhāri describes these as cities of considerable size, lying two days' march apart, and one of them was situated half a league distant from the sea. Their people were rich traders who had dealings chiefly with India' (p. 330). 'The ruins of Armabīl are probably at Lus Bela and those of Kanbālī at Khayrakot' (p. 330 f. n.).

From Armanbel, Chach proceeded to the district of Makrān (p. 38). When he went beyond the steep declivity and the hills of Makrān, he found himself in the division of Bakr. There was an ancient fort in that town called Kanbar (or Kang, or Kanarpur or Kinarpur). Kanbar may be identified with Kannazbur in Makrān which is frequently written as Kannajbur (Le Strange, p. 329, f.n. 2).

From this Chach proceeded towards Kirmān and encamped on a small stream running between Kirmān and Makrān. Certain date trees on that stream were fixed as the boundary between Kirmān and his own dominions. It is difficult to fix this line. In the mediæval period the boundary line between Kirmān and Makrān ran to the east of Banpur near Fahraz, and Chach's dominions may be said to extend to its neighbourhood.

'From there Chach returned to Armanbel, and passing through the district of Tūrān, he came into the desert and no one dared to fight with him till he arrived at Kandāil (or Kandhābel), otherwise called Kandhār.' (p. 39). The identification of these places has been discussed above on the authority of Le Strange.

IV. The Fourth Division, with Brāhmanābād as its headquarters, included the southern part of the kingdom up to the sea-coast. The famous city of Brāhmanābād was 'situated in the hitherto deserted plains which stretch away to the east of the Indus, eight miles south-east of the railway station of Shahdadpur, and forty-three miles north-east of Haidarabad'. (Cousens—*Antiquities of Sind*, p. 48; for a detailed account of the topography of the locality, and the results of recent archæological excavations, cf. pp. 48-71). Brāhmanābād is now spelt as Bahmanābād on the strength of a legend that it was founded by a Persian king Bahman, but its truth may be doubted.

According to Ch° the governorship of Brāhmanābād included 'the fort of Nerun and Debal, Luhānah, Lākhah, Sammah and the river.' (p. 11). The identification of the first two is discussed in Appendix B. Luhānah, Lākhah and Sammah were three tribes, and apparently they gave their names to the districts in which they settled.

V. The Central Division, directly under the king, with headquarter at the capital city of Aler, included Kurdān, Kikānān and Barhamas. Aler, also spelt as Aror, Al Rur and in various other ways, is now represented by a small village of the same name about five miles south by east of Rohri (For topography, cf. Cousens—*Antiquities of Sind*, pp. 76-79). Kurdān and Barhamas cannot be identified.

But Kikānān, which is referred to in Balādhuri as al-Kikān played an important part in history. Le Strange identifies it with modern Kelat (p. 332). There is no doubt that Ki-Kiang-na mentioned by Hiuen Tsang (Beal, vol. ii, p. 282) is to be identified with Kikān, all being variants of the Sanskrit Kekkāna. Hiuen Tsang places this region to the west of Fa-la-na, about 350 miles south-east of Tsao-Kuta, the capital of which has been located at or near Ghazni. The position of Ki-Kiang-na would therefore very well correspond with a region 'in the vicinity of Pishin and Quetta' as Cunningham supposed, in spite of the criticism of Watters (vol. ii, p. 262). Kikān may thus be located in the hilly region containing the Bolan Pass.

Balādhuri says: 'al-Kikān is part of the land of as-Sind where it borders on Khurāsān.' As Le Strange has observed, Khurāsān at that time included all the Muslim provinces east of the Great Desert, as far as Sijistān (p. 382). Kikān would thus be located in the hilly region to the east of the Helmund and Kandahar rivers, and this agrees well with the identification proposed above, viz. the hilly region round the Bolan Pass.

B. THE EXPEDITION OF MUHAMMAD IBN-KĀSİM

Muhammad Kāsim marched from Shiraz (p. 76) to Makrān. He then proceeded via Kannabūr to Armanbel. The identification of these two places has been discussed above. It seems that he followed the route described in detail by Ibn Khurdādhbih, which starting from Fahraj, in Kirmān, on the border of the great desert, led by 14 stages to Fannazbūr or Kannajbūr, the then capital of Makrān. (Le Strange, p. 332).

From Armanbel, Muhammad followed the road along the coast to Debal, where he expected to be joined by the force under Hazim and Mughaira, and the boats carrying the siege materials.

The identification of the famous sea-port of Debal is still a matter of dispute. Formerly it used to be identified with Thaṭṭah, but Raverty ably refuted this view by quoting several passages from old writers wherein Debal is distinguished from Thaṭṭah (*J. A. S. B.* 1892, p. 317 f.n. 315). Since then Mr. Cousens has re-affirmed the identification with slight modifications. 'There was', he says, 'Dewal proper, the city that the Arabs assaulted, and, later, as the state of the river necessitated, a port nearer the mouth, to serve the city'. . . . This port became known as Bandar Dewal (port of Dewal) as the Tuh fatuḥ-i-Kirām calls it. . . . Later writers, losing sight of the connection of Dewal with Thaṭṭah, thus came to speak of Dewal Bandar as Dewal only.' (Op. cit, p. 124). This view has been supported by Oldham (*Ind. Ant.*, 1931, p. 20).

Thus, according to Cousens, Debal, at the time of Muhammad ibn-Kāsim, occupied the site of Thaṭṭah, but later on, as the mouth of the river advanced further south, the name was transferred to the port that served the city. This is undoubtedly a good hypothesis, but does not carry immediate conviction, and so the question must be regarded as open. Cunningham places Debal on the western bank of the Baghār river, below the junction of the southern branch of the Ghāra, about 5 miles to the north of Lari Bandar (Cunn. *Anc. Geo.*, p. 342). According to Raverty, the town was about 15 miles from Thaṭṭah and stood near to the shrine

of Pír Patho, or a little further to the south-west, at the foot of the Makkahlí hills. and near the Bhágar branch of the Indus which was in those days a great stream (*J.A.S.B.* 1892, p. 322 f.n. V. Smith—*Early Hist. Ind.*, p. 104).

According to Haig, Debal is now represented by the ruins at Kakaṛ Bukēra, 20 miles south-west of Thaṭhah (*Indus Delta Country*, pp. 44. ff. where other views on the subject are discussed).

According to *Sind Gazetteer* (1919), the most probable site of the seaport of Debal seems to be Bhambor. The following account of the place is taken from the *Gazetteer of the Province of Sind*, B volume I (1919), p. 53.

'Bhambor is the local name of a mound of ruins on a low rocky elevation situated on the north bank of the Gharo creek $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles westwards from the village of Gharo in the Taluka of Mirpur Sakro . . . The remains of a fort, with walls and bastions, are distinctly traceable, and from among the heaps of broken bricks, old coins have been frequently picked up after a fall of rain . . . As the Gharo creek is the most westerly channel of the Indus, it is probably the oldest . . . This also gives an air of probability to the hypothesis that Bhambor, and not Thaṭhah, nor any of the other places that have been suggested was the great Hindu town known as Debal.' Raverty, of course, says that the identification of Bhambor with Debal is wholly out of the question (*op. cit.*, p. 322) but I do not see any adequate reason for this sweeping assertion in his elaborate note. But the objections urged by Cousens (*op. cit.*, p. 80) are most cogent. The writer in the *Gazetteer* himself admits that 'there is not room on the site for a town of any size and no direction in which it could have extended.' This seems to be a vital objection, for according to Ch^o Debal must have been a town of considerable area.

From Debal, Muhammad proceeded to Nerun which is represented by modern Haidarabad. It was situated on a hill which is now called Ganja, $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles long, and 700 yards broad with a height of 80 ft. (*Cun. Anc. Geo.*, pp. 320-22).

From Nerun, Muhammad advanced to the fort of Siwistan or Sehwan (*cf.* Haig, *Indus Delta country*, pp. 54-55), and its ruler fled to Sisam, on the bank of the Kanba, the residence of the ruler of Budhia. After Siwistan fell, Muhammad proceeded to Sisam. The place cannot be definitely located, but Haig thinks Sisam may be identified with Shah Hasan, a place at the western end of Manchchar lake (Haig, *op. cit.*, p. 58). Kanba is apparently the Kumbh river (*J.A.S.B.* 1892, p. 470-Map; but Haig takes it to be the Manchchaur lake, *op. cit.*, p. 58).

Muhammad returned to Nerun. From this place he began his great campaign against the king of Sind. Proceeding along the western bank of the Indus, he passed through the countries known as Raor and Jitor and encamped on a site opposite Dáhar's army. We further learn that he crossed the river near Sakrah, opposite the fort of Bet, the ruler of which had already gone over to him, and that the passage was facilitated by posting strong garrison at the island of Bet.

After Muhammad had crossed over to the eastern side, only a lake stood between him and Dáhar's army. As soon as Muhammad crossed this lake, Dáhar went to the fort of Raor, and having left his baggage and retinue, took up position in front of the Arab army. There the great decisive battle was fought. The line of advance followed by Muhammad from the time he left Nerun till the decisive battle was fought, cannot be properly understood in the absence of definite identification of any of the places mentioned above. It is obvious that there was an island (Bet) in the river Indus opposite Sakrah where Muhammad crossed it, and that the fort of Raor could not be very far from the landing place of the Muhammadan army on the eastern side of the Indus. But views diverge very widely regarding the location of these places. Haig places Raor in Lower

therefore, while the ever-shifting course of the rivers of Sind, must make any identification at best a hypothetical one, there is nothing in the proposed identification of the island of Bet with Bhakar, and Raor with Rohri, which may be regarded as *prima facie* impossible. Haig, who studied the course of the rivers of Sind very thoroughly, believes that as early as Alexander's time a channel passed through Rohri-Bakhar gap, its bed becoming in later times, the channel of the main river.

The traditional legend which accounts for the shifting of the river from Alor to Rohri, may be based upon an actual change of the river-course, but it is obviously impossible to fix the time of the change by an attempt to find out the date of the legendary king Dilu Rai (Cousens, op. cit., pp. 148-149) or otherwise (Haig, op. cit., pp. 133-4).

It may be mentioned here that Cousens has placed the fort of Raor, 'some twenty to twenty-five miles to the west or west-by-south of Alor, just below Kingri' (*Ibid*, p. 23, p. 24. f.n. 1).

Certain passages in Ch^o indicate that the place where the Muslim army crossed the river was not very far from Alor. Thus while Muhammad ibn-Kásim was encamped on the other side of the Mihrán, ready to cross the river, Bhandwir Samani came to Dáhar and said: 'O King . . . you are amusing yourself with the games of chess and dice while the Arab army has already arrived and alighted by your capital' (Ch^o, pp. 121-122).

This shows that the point where Muhammad crossed the river may be in the neighbourhood of Rohri or Kingri but cannot be placed very far to the south as proposed by Raverty and Haig.

This view is strengthened by the accounts of Mir M'asúm. According to this writer, Muhammad, after the fall of Sehwan, rejected the advice given him to attack Bahmanábád first, and instead, marched direct to Alor, and killed Dáhar in an engagement near the city. Mir M'asúm has here confused Raor with Aror, but as the two places were quite close and their names resemble each other, the mistake is easily explained. But Mir M'asúm definitely states that ~~from Bahmanábád~~, Muhammad did not march towards Bahmanábád but towards Aror. This is also corroborated by the fact that after Bahmanábád fell, Muhammad marched towards Aror and Bagrur, although the last-named place ~~was not connected with Raor~~. Raverty's attempt to explain it away is not convincing (op. cit., pp. 217, 218-19).

The question naturally arises why Muhammad, ~~after the fall of Sehwan~~, ~~did not march towards Bahmanábád~~ ~~but towards Aror~~, ~~and killed Dáhar in an engagement near the city~~. The reason ~~was~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Arab~~ ~~army~~ ~~had~~ ~~followed~~ ~~Dáhar's~~ ~~son~~ ~~Jaisimha~~ ~~to~~ ~~Bahmanábád~~, ~~and~~ ~~he~~ ~~was~~ ~~wasting~~ ~~time~~ ~~by~~ ~~prolonged~~ ~~siege~~ ~~of~~ ~~Alor~~, ~~Muhammad~~ ~~was~~ ~~forced~~ ~~to~~ ~~leave~~ ~~the~~ ~~city~~ ~~before~~ ~~it~~ ~~could~~ ~~gather~~ ~~strength~~.

After the defeat and death of Dáhar in an ~~engagement near the city~~, the Sindhians avoided pitched battles and defended ~~the~~ ~~kingdom~~ ~~such~~ ~~as~~ ~~Raor~~, ~~Bahrur~~, ~~Dahlelah~~, ~~Bahmanábád~~ ~~and~~ ~~other~~ ~~places~~. Dahlelah cannot be identified with certainty, ~~but~~ ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~probable~~ ~~that~~ ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~as~~ ~~Bahmanábád~~. Dahlelah may be the same ~~as~~ ~~Bahmanábád~~ (*J. A. S. B.*, 1892, p. 317).

After the fall of Alor, Muhammad ~~proceeded to the north~~ ~~and~~ ~~conquered~~ ~~successively~~ ~~Bábiyah~~, ~~Gholconda~~, ~~Sikkah~~ ~~and~~ ~~other~~ ~~places~~. ~~These~~ ~~places~~ ~~are~~ ~~identified~~, ~~but~~ ~~the~~ ~~position~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~other~~ ~~three~~ ~~are~~ ~~not~~ ~~known~~.

Al-Baládhuri records several other ~~expeditions~~ ~~of~~ ~~Muhammad~~ ~~from~~ ~~Multan~~. The places named ~~are~~ ~~not~~ ~~identified~~ ~~with~~ ~~certainity~~ ~~but~~ ~~it~~ ~~appears~~ ~~that~~ ~~Muhammad~~ ~~personally~~ ~~was~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~city~~ ~~and~~ ~~other~~ ~~two~~.

Later on, Junaid raided Kīraj, which had broken the covenant, and sent his lieutenants against Mirmad (or Marmad—Elliot, vol. i, p. 126) al-Mandal, Dahnaj, Barwas, Uzain and al-Malibah. The identification of most of these places has been suggested in the text (p. 41). Surast is evidently Surāshṭra and Dahnaj cannot be identified.

As to Kīraj against which both Muhammad and Junaid marched in person, it is evidently the same as Kurij mentioned in Ch° (p. 181 ff.), for Balādhuri gives the name of the king of Kīraj as Duhar while in Ch° the king of Kurij is written as Drohar.

Kīraj may be identified with Kira of Indian literature, which according to *Bṛhat Saṃhitā* belongs to the North-East division of India.

The details given in Ch° enable us to locate more definitely the site of ancient Kira. Ch° tells the romantic story how Jaisia, the son of Dāhar, the deceased king of Sind, was at first given shelter by Drohar, the king of Kurij, but was afterwards driven away by the machinations of Drohar's sister whose immoral proposals he refused with scorn. It is related that having learnt of the plot to murder him, Jaisia left Kurij and journeyed on, till he arrived at Jālandhar in the land of Kashmir.

Thus this country should be placed in the neighbourhood of Jālandhara. Now two inscriptions from Baijnath give the name of that place as Kīragrāma, and refer to its rulers as subordinate vassals of the lord of Jālandhara. Burgess supplies the following note about the place. 'Kīragrāma or Baijnath is a small town in the east of the Kangra district about thirty miles east of Kot Kangra, in latitude 32° 3' N. and longitude 76° 41' E. The number of old temples about the village point to its having been in early times a place of some note.'

The identity of the name and its proximity to Jālandhara naturally point to Kīragrāma or Baijnath and the surrounding tracts as the ancient Kira country, referred to by the Arabs as al-Kīraj or al-Kurij.

